

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXI.

BALTIMORE, MAY, 1906.

No. 5.

SIR WALTER SCOTT AND ALFRED DE VIGNY.

In *La Jeunesse des Romantiques*—Victor Hugo, *Alfred de Vigny*,¹ which has just appeared, M. Ernest Dupuis studies, p. 290, "Les Origines littéraires d'Alfred de Vigny," but only as a poet. This study had already appeared in the form of an article in the July-September number for 1903 of *La Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*. Perhaps he thought that nothing more could be said of "Les Origines littéraires d'Alfred de Vigny" as a prose-writer after the apparently exhaustive book of M. Louis Maigron, *Le Roman historique à l'Époque romantique—Essai sur l'influence de Walter Scott*.² Yet there is always something to be gleaned after the most careful reaper. Every critic agrees that *Cinq-Mars*, the first prose work of de Vigny, is a clever imitation of Sir Walter Scott's methods, but except for the proofs of a general order offered by M. Maigron—dialogue, picturesqueness, local color, manners, costumes, etc.,—nobody, so far as I know, has shown how closely and how frequently Alfred de Vigny in *Cinq-Mars* has imitated Scott in the details. This article being, as it were, a stake in a prospective field, I shall mention, without lengthy discussions, the similarities in the *dramatis personæ*, the analogies in the situations and incidents, and the imitations of passages that I have noticed so far.

Almost every character in *Cinq-Mars* has his counterpart, if not his prototype, in *Quentin Durward*: cf. Quentin and Cinq-Mars, Crawford and Bassompierre, Dunois and de Thou, Tristan l'Hermite and Laubardemont, Oliver and Father Joseph, The Bohemian and The Spaniard, the Duke of Orleans and Gaston, Isabelle de Croye and Marie de Gonzaga, Hameline de Croye and Anna of Austria. Besides, the Duke of Bouillon is, ac-

cording to history, related to William de la Marck, and Louis XIII to Louis XI.

Let us first remember that *Quentin Durward* appeared about June 20, 1823,³ and was translated at once into French⁴; and that de Vigny himself states⁵: "en 1824, à Oloron, dans les Pyrénées, je composai entièrement et écrivis sur une feuille de papier le plan entier de *Cinq-Mars*. Il n'y a pas de livre que j'aie plus longtemps et plus sérieusement médité . . . Ce ne fut qu'en 1826 que je me mis à écrire le livre d'un bout à l'autre, et, comme on dit, d'une seule encre."

The first five cases of similarity in the characters of the young heroes, Quentin and Cinq-Mars, are historical as far as the latter is concerned and are given because, in my opinion, they were somewhat responsible—with other resemblances, of course, mentioned further on—for suggesting to de Vigny the idea of building a historical novel around the tragical fate of Cinq-Mars:

- 1) Both young heroes belong to noble families.
- 2) They become great favorites with their royal protectors.
- 3) Each is or falls in love and sees his affection requited. (Yet most of the details about Cinq-Mars' love are fictitious.)
- 4) Each becomes ambitious because of his love.
- 5) Each one falls or comes near falling a victim to the politics of his royal benefactor.

The following points of resemblance are not entirely true to history or are fictitious as far as Cinq-Mars is concerned. They prove that de Vigny was greatly influenced by the reading of *Quentin Durward* in the moulding of his own hero:

- 1) Both books are named after the youths.
- 2) The young men are of the same age at the beginning of both stories.
- 3) They win royal favor by the display of their bravery, Quentin by crossing a ford that the king

¹ Paris, Société Française d'Imprimerie et de Librairie, 1905.

² Paris, Hachette, 1898.

³ See Lockhart, *Life of Walter Scott*, vol. v.

⁴ See Maigron, p. 110.

⁵ *Journal d'un Poète*, p. 240.

thought was impassable, and later by saving Louis' life in a boar-hunt; Cinq-Mars by suggesting and helping in the storming of a bastion of the besieged city of Perpignan. (The truth is that Cinq-Mars became a page in the household of Richelieu when he was only fifteen, and later attracted Louis XIII's attention by singing an air composed by the royal musician.⁶)

4) Each enters the Royal Guard (Quentin the Archers of the Scottish Guard, Cinq-Mars the Men-at-arms of the King's Guard) by special privilege and at the request of the members of these regiments whose exclusiveness was almost proverbial.

5) Both show hesitation in accepting this great honor.

6) Yet they accept it.

7) They leave, the one his country, the other his home, to seek their fortunes in the world, and in doing so, they both follow the advice of clerical friends.

8) Both have a prophetic dream. It has almost the same trend and turns into a nightmare which is interrupted by an unexpected visit. In each case the visitor speaks to them of their future and mentions their beloved.

9) Each gains the gratitude of a foreigner or pseudo-foreigner almost in the same way and is later rewarded for his charitable deed.

10) Both start their careers by making a powerful and mortal enemy through an act of violence.

11) They show on a certain night-trip the same symptoms of lovesickness and extreme fatigue.

12) Both follow similar tactics when surrounded by a crowd in a strange city.

13) Quentin participates in a two-cornered duel and Cinq-Mars in a three-cornered one. The combats are conducted along the same lines. The youths come out victorious and unharmed, but they are wounded shortly after, Quentin in a second duel, Cinq-Mars in the taking of a bastion.

14) They boldly take a leading part in the attempt to save the lives of two members of the Church, but both utterly fail.

15) They have a few similar qualities.

Of course, there are also points of unlikeness.

For instance, we may notice that, in general, things are not always carried to extremes in *Quentin Durward* because it is fictitious, while de Vigny was bound by historical facts to go farther in the carrying out of plots, vengeance, etc. The greatest difference in characters lies in the light-heartedness, the good humor, the sunny and genial disposition of Quentin and the gloominess, the sorrowful and grave mien, the melancholy nature of Cinq-Mars. De Vigny's hero, from the very beginning, is doomed and bears on his forehead the seal of Fatality (a fact, by the way, which is far from being historical, for historians describe him to us as having been "a gay, lively youth, . . . a vain and frivolous page, . . . without solid intellectual or moral foundation, . . . fast degenerating into a conceited fop"). This deviation from history finds its explanation in the affected morbidness of the romanticists, "le mal du siècle," and the gloomy disposition of the author himself. "La sévérité froide et un peu sombre de mon caractère n'était pas native. Elle m'a été donnée par la vie."⁷

The following points of likeness in the characters will not be divided into historical and non-historical, because it is always difficult in de Vigny to point out where history ends and romance begins. He himself says⁸: "Ce qui fait l'originalité du livre, c'est que tout y a l'air roman et que tout y est histoire."

1) Isabelle de Croye and Marie de Gonzaga are foreigners.

2) They are errant-princesses and find a temporary home at the French court.

3) They are very young and nearly the same age when they meet their lovers for the first time. (The love of Cinq-Mars for Mary is historically true, but de Vigny makes her younger than she really was. It would have been too unromantic to show his hero in love with a girl eight years his senior.)

4) Both are of a higher rank than their lovers.

5) They decline to marry other suitors who are, as it were, forced upon them by their princely or royal guardians. Besides, both are loved by men of royal blood. In fact, both decline a throne.

⁶ See Sankey's edition of *Cinq-Mars*. Introduction, p. xxv. Boston, D. C. Heath & Co.

⁷ *Journal d'un Poète*, p. 59.

⁸ *Journal d'un Poète*, p. 34.

Resemblances in the lesser personages also abound.

1) Lord Crawford and Marshal de Bassompierre are both foreigners and have faithfully served under preceding kings.

2) One is the Captain of the Archers of the Scottish Guard; the other, the former Colonel-General of the Swiss. (Both regiments then being recruited among foreigners.)

3) They are representatives of the preceding generation: well-preserved, frank, fearless, loyal to their respective masters.

4) Both show a decided fondness for wine and the stories of former times.

5) Finally, they are very much interested in the welfare and ultimate success of the young heroes, namely, Quentin and Cinq-Mars.

Dunois and de Thou symbolize blind fidelity, self-sacrifice on the altar of Friendship.

The villains also show some similar characteristics.

1) For instance, Oliver le Dain and Father Joseph are at once the confidential agents, the servile instruments and the advisers of their masters.

2) They are very familiar with them and sometimes go so far as to chide them for their lack of spirit.

3) Both are now and then scolded by their masters. In fact, they are despised by them.

4) They are ambitious for higher honors, but fail in winning them.

5) They are sly and full of their importance. People are afraid of them and pay them outward signs of respect.

6) Each has a rival in the favor of his master and tries to lower him.

7) Both attempt, at the beginning, to prevent the advancement of the young heroes.

(Father Joseph, being a somewhat complex character, combines within himself the rôles of Oliver and Cardinal Balue. The latter and Joseph are both ready to betray their masters for the sake of their own advantage. Let us recall here that de Vigny prolonged the life of Father Joseph by four years; he really died in 1638 and, of course, had no hand in Cinq-Mars' downfall. De Vigny was only imitating the boldness of his model, Scott, who in *Quentin Durward* did not hesitate

to antedate the murder of the Bishop of Liege by fifteen years.)

Another pair of villains next call our attention.

1) Tristan l'Hermite, the Provost-Marshal of Louis XI, and de Laubardemont, the counsellor or reporter of State, are merely the factotums, the murderous satellites of Louis and Richelieu.

2) Both are anxious to supplant their rivals in the favor of their masters.

3) They are despised by them.

4) Each is awkward in appearance and has a hypocritical mien.

5) Both have been struck by the young heroes and are anxious to avenge the blow by bringing about their downfall.

A third pair of villains is presented to us in the persons of the Bohemian and the Spaniard.

1) The authors do them the honor of devoting to them one or two special chapters.

2) The first is a foreigner, the second a pseudo-foreigner.

3) They are vagrants, outcasts, and their main occupation is to act as spies and guides. They know thoroughly the country and the frontiers.

4) Both are savage looking; yet they have some education for that time.

5) They are now and then facetious and garrulous.

6) They are daring and reckless.

7) They are hardened criminals.

8) They are stoical before death. Both die a violent death.

9) They are entrusted with very important missions.

10) In spite of their villainy, they can be stirred by a fine feeling; we see both of them grateful to the young heroes for service rendered and anxious to repay them.

N. B.—The atheistic views of the Bohemian which we expected to hear expounded by his counterpart, Jacques, are curiously enough shared by Father Joseph, a Capuchin.

The similarities in the characters of Hameline de Croye and Anna of Austria are slight but still worthy of notice.

1) Both are sentimental and more or less in love with the young heroes; they see their affection unrequited.

2) They desire the young ladies under their care to marry royal suitors.

Anna of Austria combines the parts of Hameline of Croye and the Countess of Crèvecœur: the latter and the queen act as protectresses of the young ladies.

Let us end this long list of similarities by a last one, which is really the first to impose itself upon the reader's notice on opening *Cinq-Mars*: the old servant, Grandchamp, gruff, sententious, but touching through his faithfulness and loyalty, forcibly reminds us at once of old Caleb Balderstone in *The Bride of Lammermoor*.

De Vigny did not limit his imitation of his model to the delineation of his personages, but found it convenient to follow his footsteps in the very structure of the story, in the selection of certain situations and incidents, and even in the composition of a few passages. First, both books are divided into two parts, each part into chapters, with this difference however, that chapter-numbers run on in de Vigny's second part. Every chapter bears a definite title and is preceded by an epigraph. This innovation originated in the novel with Sir Walter Scott, who no doubt had been influenced in adopting it by the example of the English essayists. Let us add that each book has a preface, that of de Vigny being rather pompous, and ends with historical notes.

M. Maigron cites only one reminiscence (page 262), ". . . le repas du soir" au château de Chaumont: une scène visiblement imitée d'*Ivanhoe* (chap. 1). The reminiscences I have quoted above: the dream, the duel, the night-journey, the tactics of the young men when surrounded by a strange crowd, etc., are more visibly imitated from Scott than the one cited by M. Maigron. The following ones are also very striking. The stories begin in the same region, in Touraine. The attitudes, the feelings and the prayers of Richelieu in his tent and of Louis XI in Earl Herbert's Tower, are very much alike. The description of the château of Pierre-Encise strangely coincides with that of the castle of Peronne. M.

⁹ It was the noon meal, contrary to M. Maigron's statement: "la cloche du château ayant sonné à *midi*, selon l'usage, le dîner de la famille qui l'habitait," . . . *Cinq-Mars* (chap. 1).

Maigron has failed to notice it, but makes the following suggestion (p. 264)—"Voyez la description du château de Pierre-Encise sur les bords de la Saône (*Les Prisonniers*) et quelques détails du *Procès* et du *Martyre* dont Hugo et Dumas semblent s'être souvenus dans *Notre-Dame de Paris* et *Isabelle de Bavière* . . ." Some textual passages also recall similar ones in Scott:

Quentin Durward (vol. I, chap. 2).

. . . the capital of ancient Touraine, whose rich plain has been termed the garden of France.

(II. 7., note.) Indeed . . . it (*i. e.*, Peronne) was never taken by an enemy, but preserved the proud name of Peronne la Pucelle, . . .

(II. 8.) Peronne is a virgin fortress.

(I. 2.) His companion . . . said, "Hush, hush, Sir Varlet with the Velvet Pouch! for I forgot to tell you, that one great danger of these precincts is, that the very leaves of the trees are like so many ears, which carry all which is spoken to the king's own cabinet."

(II. 11.) "Know then, O King," said Martius, "that this only I can tell certainly concerning mine own death, that it shall take place exactly twenty-four hours before that of your Majesty."

The following parallel is the most striking one I have noticed:

(II. 14):

"And you obeyed your orders accordingly?" said the king.

"I did, Sire," replied the Scot.

"You omit a circumstance," said the Duke.

"You were set upon in the forest by two wandering knights."

Cinq-Mars (chap. 1).

Connaissez-vous cette contrée que l'on a surnommée le jardin de la France?

(1). . . seule province que n'occupa jamais l'étranger, . . .

(21.) "Allons! allons! ne parlez pas si haut," répondit brusquement le vieux domestique; les murs ont des oreilles de cardinal, et surtout les églises . . .

(5.) (Grandier dit:)
"Au nom du Dieu vivant, je t'ajourne à trois ans, Laubardemont, juge prévaricateur."

(10):

(Louis XI dit:)
"Mais que vois-je! vous ici, monsieur de Thou? Qui êtes-vous venu juger?"

— Je crois, Sire, répondit Coislin, qu'il a plutôt condamné à mort quelques Espagnols, car il est entré le second dans la place.

— Je n'ai frappé per-

"It does not become me to remember or to proclaim such an incident," said the youth, *blushing* ingenuously.

"But it doth not become me to forget it," said the Duke of Orleans. "This youth discharged his commission manfully, and maintained his trust in a manner that I shall long remember.—Come to my apartment, Archer, when this matter is over, and thou shalt find I have not *forgot thy brave bearing*, while I am glad to see it is equalled by thy *modesty*."

Cinq-Mars calling on his old tutor, L'Abbé Quillet at Loudun, his knocking at the door, the appearance of the old man—with a description of his dress and attitude,—his warm reception, their "comparing of notes," the old abbé in hiding and preparing to flee to Italy, his talk about their common friends and their future prospects, all this is a visible reminiscence of the visit paid by Waverley to his old friend, The Baron of Bradwardine.¹⁰

Peveril of the Peak also inspired de Vigny several times. This passage may be a faint reminiscence :

Peveril of the Peak (39).

(Buckingham says of Alice Bridgenorth,—) "So how the girl is to be disposed of—for I shall have little fancy to keep her here, and she is too wealthy to be sent down to Cliefden as a housekeeper—is a matter to be thought on."

sonne, monsieur, interrompit de Thou *en rougissant* ; ce n'est point mon métier ; ici je n'ai aucun mérite, j'accompagnais M. de Cinq-Mars, mon ami.

— Nous aimons votre *modestie* autant que cette *bravoure*, et nous *n'oublions* pas ce trait . . .

Cinq-Mars (13).

(Laubardemont says of his niece, Jeanne de Belfiel,—) "Quant à cette petite imbécile que voilà, je vais la donner à un ancien juge secret, à présent contrebandier dans les Pyrénées, à Oloron ; il la fera ce qu'il voudra, servante dans sa *posada* par exemple . . ."

The way de Laubardemont acts towards his niece somewhat corresponds to that of Christian Bridgenorth towards his daughter, Fenella, and his niece, Alice. The whole chapter 7, "Le Cabinet," in *Cinq-Mars* seems to have had for its basis chapter 28, "Buckingham's Levee," in *Peveril of the Peak*. The signal that Cinq-Mars

(chap. 25) must give (but fails to give) to his friends if he wants them to save him from the hands of the executioner—to put on his hat—is nearly an exact reproduction of the one Julian Peveril (chap. 36) is asked to give (and fails to give) when in the same straits—"to put on his hat a white band or white feather or knot or ribbon of the same colour." Finally, a direct inspiration from *Peveril* is found in the fainting fit of Marie de Gonzaga on hearing the ominous words of the king. We have the same surroundings : an evening party at Court.

Peveril of the Peak (49).

The Countess . . . placed herself near Fenella as she called her little mute ; and, while making signs to her, contrived to place her hand on her wrist. At this moment the king, passing near them, said, "This is a horrid deed—the villain Christian has stabbed young Peveril !" The mute evidence of the pulse, which bounded as if a cannon had been discharged close by the poor girl's ear, was accompanied by such a loud scream of agony, as distressed, while it startled, the good-natured monarch himself.

Cinq-Mars (26).

En cet instant une horloge sonna minuit. Le Roi leva la tête :

— Ah ! ah ! dit-il, ce matin, à la même heure, M. le Grand, notre cher ami, a passé un mauvais moment.

Un cri perçant partit auprès de lui ; il frémit et se jeta de l'autre côté, renversant le jeu. Marie de Mantoue, sans connaissance, était dans les bras de la reine.

This same dramatic incident evidently inspired another passage in *Cinq-Mars* (4) :

" . . . Nous avons su de ce même père, ici présent, . . . que soupçonnant cette demoiselle d'être possédée, à cause du bruit qui s'était répandu dès longtemps de l'admiration d'Urbain Grandier pour elle, il eut l'heureuse idée de l'éprouver, et lui dit tout à coup en l'abordant : *Grandier vient d'être mis à mort* ; sur quoi elle ne poussa qu'un seul grand cri, et tomba morte, . . .

Of all the writers who have expressed an opinion on *Cinq-Mars*, Victor Hugo is the one who in my opinion showed the best judgment and came nearest to the truth. In an article that appeared in *La Quotidienne*, July 30, 1826, the poet says : "Nul doute que si on eût présenté ce livre comme un nouvel ouvrage de Walter Scott, traduit par Charles Nodier, plus d'un lecteur y eût été pris au premier abord. . ."

¹⁰ See *Waverley*, chapters 53 and 54.

It would, then, have been a repetition of what had taken place in Germany in 1823, when Willibald Alexis (Häring) presented his maiden work, *Walladmor*, as a translation from Scott without being at once detected.¹¹

Before M. Maigron's book, every critic (Sainte-Beuve, Stuart Mill, Taine, etc.), seems to have taken for granted that de Vigny was greatly influenced by Scott, that his historical novel was a novel "à la Walter Scott," without ever trying to prove it. De Vigny, so far as I know, never acknowledged his debt to his great model. M. Maigron, in 1898, conclusively showed this influence, but in the main lines, from a general point of view. Placing myself at closer range, I have aimed to prove more directly a) that *Quentin Durward* was the book the reading of which specially induced de Vigny to write a historical novel about the downfall of Louis XIII's favorite; b) that most of the fictitious details of the first part in *Cinq-Mars* are, as it were, adapted from *Quentin Durward*; c) that de Vigny did not limit his imitation to *Quentin Durward*, but borrowed situations and incidents from other romances of Scott.

While comparing de Vigny's book with some of the novels of his model, I have wondered why he confined himself to so servile an imitation. The only example I can remember of such a close inspiration is that of Maeterlinck concentrating the most dramatic effects of Shakespeare's best tragedies into one play: *Princesse Maleine*. The other subsequent prose work of de Vigny indicates that he could have written an interesting historical novel out of his own material. Furthermore, he was considered as being endowed with a wonderful imagination. Gaspard de Pons, in *Adieux Poétiques*, states: "Je ne dirai ni en vers ni en prose qu' Alfred de Vigny soit le premier de nos écrivains dans un sens absolu; mais qu'il soit . . . le premier par l'imagination, c'est ce que je dirai toujours en prose comme en vers . . ."

That he was easily impressed is shown in his poems, which are permeated with the influence of the great French and English poets. Victor Hugo, Mérimée, Balzac, Dumas, etc., also

adopted Scott's methods and now and then borrowed freely from him, but none of them proved to be so apt an imitator as de Vigny, who seemed to have relied much more on his memory than on his imagination.

VICTOR E. FRANÇOIS.

College of the City of New York.

THE DATING OF KLOPSTOCK'S ODE, *An Gleim.*

The date, March, 1752, has been commonly accepted as the time when the ode, *An Gleim*, was written and the poem is thus dated in the original manuscript in Klopstock's handwriting, where it bears the title, "*Ode an Gleim—im März, 1752.*" There is also a copy of this made by Gleim, in which the title is "*An Gleim, 1752.*" Both of these copies were found among Gleim's papers after his death.¹ That some time elapsed between the writing of these two forms is suggested by the fact that there is a variation of text between the original (O.) and Gleim's copy (Gl.).

- v. 17, O. Er versteht es
Gl. Nun versteht ers
- v. 23, O. vom kalten, | Halben Beyfall
Gl. vom halben, | Kalten Beyfall
- v. 25, O. die sittsame
Gl. die zögernde
- v. 32, O. eisernen Nacken
Gl. stolzeren Nacken
- v. 33, O. Deutschlands Muse! Schon nah,
feurig dem Ziele nah | (Das der
Britte gepflanzt, und es mit Grie-
chischen | Lorbeern schattend um-
haint hat | Mit der heiligen Ceder
auch!)
- Gl. Deutschlands Muse! Gekrönt, feu-
rig am hohen Ziel | Das der
Britte gepflanzt, und es mit Phöb-
apolls | Lorbeerhainen umschat-
tet | Mit der Palme der Engel
auch!

¹¹ Mielke: *Geschichte des deutschen Romans, Sammlung Götschen*, no. 229, p. 140.

¹ Muncker-Pawel, *Hist. krit. Ausgabe der Oden*, Stuttgart, 1889, I. s. 102.

- v. 43, O. Deine Leyer, verstimme
Gl. Deine Leyer ; zerreise
v. 53, O. der pindische Quell
Gl. vom Hämus der Quell

The poem was first printed in the Darmstadt edition of the odes, 1771, where it appeared as the forty-third ode with the title "*An Herrn Gleim, 1752.*" In this collection the poem is the last of the odes dated 1752, which same position it occupies in all later editions. In the Muncker-Pawel edition *An Gleim* is placed first among the odes of 1752, preceding *Die beiden Musen* among others.

In this edition, it is stated that the ode was sent to Gleim, perhaps in a letter of April 9th, 1752. Franz Muncker, in his article *Drei Oden aus Klopstock's Jugendzeit*, states that this ode may have been sent in the letter of April, 1752, or perhaps in one of the same spring which has been lost.² Several poems are mentioned in that letter of April, 1752, but there is nothing to indicate that such a poem as *An Gleim* accompanied it or had been written at that time. In fact, in none of the letters of Klopstock or Gleim have I been able to find the ode mentioned, either during the year 1752 or later.

All commentators have accepted the date 1752 as the year in which the ode was written, and this appears to be so accurately settled by Klopstock's original manuscript that I hesitate to take exceptions to that date. But if we accept 1752 as its birth year, there are several inconsistencies in the poem. The ode *An Gleim* may be divided into two parts: the first being a defence of Gleim and his songs against those who take the latter too literally, and a portrayal of his character (to v. 33); and the second part an attack on Frederick the Great, in regard to whom Klopstock's opinion underwent a radical change some time in his early life.³

1. In the first part of the ode Klopstock praises Gleim's love for his friends among other characteristics, and then in strophes seven and eight writes:

² Schnorr's *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, Bd. xi, s. 273.

³ Cf. the first form of *Heinrich der Vogler* and the later form; *Friederich der Fünfte*; *Kaiser Heinrich*; *Die Rosstrappe*; *Die Verkenning*; *Ihr Tod*; *Der Traum*; *Die Rache*; *Delphi*.

"oder, von Friederichs,
Wenn, von Friederichs Preise!
Ihm die trunknere Lippe trieft,
Ohne Wünsche nach Lohn; aber auch unbelohnt!

That is, Gleim's lips fairly drip with Frederick's praise though without wish for reward, in which he has not been disappointed as he has not been rewarded. How are we to reconcile such a statement, if made in 1752, with the fact that prior to that date Gleim had sung almost no songs in praise of Frederick the Great? Before the year 1752 Gleim had written, or rather published, only his "*scherzhafte Lieder, 1743 and 1745,*" and his "*Lieder, 1745-1749.*" That we must consider published works on Gleim's part is shown in the verse "*Ohne Wünsche nach Lohn.*" There could be no question of reward for a poet unless he published poems of praise. If we examine Gleim's early songs do we find that his lips drip with praise of Frederick? Quite the contrary, they are almost silent with regard to him although before the second book of *scherzhafte Lieder* was finished Frederick had nearly concluded the second Silesian war successfully. Notwithstanding the fact that several of the songs mention this war, only one of them is in praise of the Prussian king, *An die Stadt Prag* in which Gleim sings:

- v. 11. Du musst die besten Schönen
Mit Lorbeerzweigen krönen
Und mit gefalteten Händen
Zu meinem König senden.
Dann werden sie, im Flehen,
Sein gnädig Antlitz sehen;
Dann wird der Held beweisen,
Es dien' ihm Stahl und Eisen,
Es dienen ihm die Waffen,
Zu segnen, nicht zu strafen.
Wie wirst du dann bedauern,
Dass er durch deine Mauren
Und tausend Siegesbogen
Nicht eher eingezogen.

It was not till Gleim published his *Kriegslieder* (1756-1757) that he publicly praised the king and then nearly every poem in this collection is full of Frederick's glory. Not till these songs had appeared does it seem possible that Klopstock could have written:

"von Friederichs Preise!
Ihm die trunknere Lippe trieft."

Nearly all of Gleim's later collections contain poems praising his monarch. Even among the *Lieder nach dem Anakreon* (1766) are half a dozen that extol the king, although in the introduction to that collection Gleim writes that his *Leyer* will sing only of Amor, notwithstanding the fact that he has strung it with heavier strings and has sung of heroes and Frederick. It is well known that the king paid no attention to Gleim's flattery, but as early as 1752 his ignoring that author would not be marked enough to lead Klopstock to write "auch unbelohnt." What had Gleim done that Frederick should reward him?

2. In verses 13 and 14 Klopstock writes:

"Lacht dem Jünglinge nicht, welcher den Flatterer
Zu buchstäblich erklärt!"

The word "Flatterer" Hamel refers to the poem of Gleim's, in which the latter applies that name to himself.⁴ This is the poem:

An Chloe.

Getreu soll ich, O Chloe, seyn,
Ich Flatterer? getreu?
Ich träumte jüngst, der Liebesgott
Hätt' an den Füßen Bley:

4th Str. Was sagt der Traum? der Liebesgott
Hätt an den Füßen Bley?
Getreu soll ich, O Chloe, seyn,
Ich Flatterer? getreu?

This ode appeared among the *Lieder nach dem Anakreon*. *Vom Verfasser des Versuchs in scherzhaften Liedern*, Berlin und Braunschweig, 1766. Körte, in his *Life of Gleim* (p. 122), states that the *Lieder nach dem Anakreon* were written after the peace of Hubertsburg, March (February?) 15th, 1763, which closed the Seven Years' War.

In no earlier poem and in none of the correspondence of Gleim or Klopstock, either with each other or with friends, have I been able to find any reference to Gleim as "der Flatterer." Hence if we are correct, with Hamel, in referring this allusion to the poem *An Chloe*, how are we to reconcile the fact that Klopstock's ode dated 1752 contains a reference to a poem which did not appear till 1766, and which was not written before 1763? While Klopstock might have seen

this poem before 1766, it is scarcely probable that he would call Gleim "der Flatterer" until that name had become known to the public through the edition of his works.

3. A comparison of the ode *Die beiden Musen* and the variations of strophe nine as it exists in Klopstock's manuscript (O.), in Gleim's copy (Gl.) and in its present form (N), is interesting and may throw some light on the relation between the two odes. The three forms of the strophe are as follows:

O. Deutschlands Muse! Schon nach, feurig dem Ziele
nach,
(Das der Britte gepflanzt und es mit Griechischen
Lorbeern schattend umschirmt hat
Mit der heiligen Ceder auch!)⁵

Gl. Deutschlands Muse! Gekrönt, feurig am hohen Ziel
Das der Britte gepflanzt, und es mit Phöbapolls
Lorbeerhainen umschattet
Mit der Palme der Engel auch!

N. Deutschlands Muse! In Flug' eilend zum hohen Ziel,
Das mit heiligem Spross Barden umschatteten,
Hin zum höheren Ziele,
Das der Himmlischen Palm' umweht,

In O. the Muse is seen near the high goal planted by the English poets, protected by the "Griechischen Lorbeern" and also by the "heiligen Ceder," or as in Gl., by the "Palme der Engel." In N. the figure is more carefully worked out and the distinction between the goals of sacred and profane poetry is made clearer. In *Die beiden Musen* the second strophe describes these two goals:

Zwey Ziele gränzten, wo sich der Blick verlor
Dort an die Laufbahn. Eichen beschatteten
Des Hains das eine; nah dem andren
Weheten Palmen im Abendschimmer.

In the earliest form of this strophe, in the copy partly in Gleim's handwriting, are found the same words describing these two goals as are used in the early texts of the ninth strophe given above (O., Gl.). This first variant is as follows:

Zwey Ziele gränzten, wo sich der Blick verlor
Dort an die Laufbahn. Dieses umschatteten
Geweihte Lorbeern, jenes weitre
Wehende Palmen im Abendschimmer.

Along the course toward the two goals the young

⁴ Edition of Klopstock's Odes in Kürschner's *National-Litteratur*, vol. 47, p. 92.

⁵ Text from Schnorr's *Archiv.*, Bd. xi, s. 274.

and trembling German Muse is to race with the Muse of Albion, who is accustomed to such contests.

v. 2. mit der britannischen
Sah ich in Streitlauf Deutschlands Muse
Heiss zu den krönenden Zielen fliegen.

In strophe eight the English Muse addresses "Thuiscone," pointing to the goals :

Dort steht es! Aber siehst du das weitere
Und seine Kron' auch?

Finally, in the last strophe the two muses are flying down the course toward the goals.

In the ode, *Die beiden Musen*, the two goals and the Muse hurrying toward them, are essential features of the poem, and they are described in detail, whereas in the ode, *An Gleim*, we have simply an allusion to them as to a picture already known, if not to the public, at least to the author himself and to the recipient of the ode. This would seem to show that *Die beiden Musen* was written before *An Gleim*; the third variant of the strophe (N) was certainly composed later than the ode, on which it is dependent for its interpretation.

4. v. 41: Lern des innersten Hains Ausspruch. This means, according to Hamel's interpretation, "der Ausspruch der echt vaterländischen Barden," that is, *Hain* is used here in the sense peculiar to Klopstock's later poems where it means the home of German poetry, or of the bards, the German poets. The word, however, was not used by him in this metaphorical sense till about the year 1766. To be sure, *Hain* in this sense is found in several of the odes before that year but not in the original versions, as the following references will show. The variants are taken from the Muncker-Pawel edition of the odes and the various texts are referred to by the letters used there :

- Gl. Gleim's copy.
- D. Darmstadt edition, 1771.
- B. Bode's edition, 1771.
- L. Lyrische Sylbenmaasse, 1764.

Wingolf I, v. 10. In the 1747 text *Hain* is used, but in the version of 1771 it is changed to *Wälder*, as there is no reference to German poetry here and Klopstock feared it might be so taken.

Wingolf III, v. 42. (1747) Höhern Gesängen.
(1771) Des Hains Gesängen.

Die beiden Musen (1752), v. 6.

Gl. D. Dieses umschatteten
Geweihete Lorbeern
B. Dieses beschattete
Des Hains Eiche

v. 24. Wuchs ich mit dir in dem Eichenhain auf.

Here again the word is not used in the figurative sense.

Kaiser Heinrich (1764), v. 14. Der deutschen Dichter Haine. This is the first use of the word in this special meaning and here it is not used metaphorically, but the idea of the grove as the home of the German poets is expressly stated. This line is really Klopstock's definition of the word *Hain* as used by him later, and therefore he felt free after this to use the word metaphorically.

Der Nachahmer (1764), v. 4.

Gl. L. Denen ums Grab Lorbeer einst weht!
B. Welche der Hain Bragas verbarg.

Sponda (1764), v. 1.

Gl. L. Der deutschen Barden Hügel
B. Der deutschen Dichter Hainen
v. 35. Gl. Liebling, da Lorbeer und
Strom er sein Lied | Lehrte.

Last form : Liebling ! mich lehrte sein Lied
Hain und Strom.

The following quotations from odes of 1766 will show that *Hain* became a favorite expression of Klopstock's in that year :

Skulda, v. 1. Ich lern es im innersten Hain. This line is also interesting because of the striking similarity of its phraseology to verse 41 quoted above : Lern des innersten Hains Ausspruch.

v. 8. Das bis hinauf in des Hains Wipfel es scholl !

v. 29. Die Neune betraten den Hain.

Der Bach, v. 1.

Bekränzt mein Haar, O Blumen des Hains
Unsre Fürsten :

v. 1. dem Hain Siona's.

v. 5. Hier in dem Hain.

v. 9. Wall' ich im Hain der Palmen.

v. 29. Aus dem Hain Thuiscons.

v. 33. O wie festlich rauschet der Hain !

v. 36. Und der Hain ruft in den Schatten.

v. 48. Denn es schweigt euch in dem Haine.

Braga, v. 23. Ich sah

Fern in den Schatten an dem Dichterhain
Braga!

v. 46. Lehre, was ich singe, den Hain!

In the absence of any positive proof to the contrary (and except the dated manuscript I have been able to find none), it would seem from 1. that the poem could not have been written before 1756-1757, the date of the *Kriegslieder*, or perhaps better, 1758, the date of their publication; 2. would show that it could not have been written before 1763, the date when Gleim began to write the *Lieder nach dem Anakreon*, or more probably not till 1766, when they were published; from 3. it would seem to be of later origin than *Die beiden Musen*; and 4. would seem to fix the year 1766 as the earliest period in which the ode could have been written. These points form such an essential part of the ode that it is impossible to assume that an earlier version existed which did not contain them and from which the date could have been copied by Klopstock in revising his work. Hence there seems to be good reason for denying that the ode, *An Gleim*, was written in 1752, and the second part, at least, could not have been composed before the year 1766.

MORTON C. STEWART.

Harvard University.

JOHN DONE'S *POLYDORON*.

In Dr. C. M. Ingleby's *Centurie of Prayse*,¹ a foot-note under Thomas Fuller reads: "We find Shakespeare treated as a name of 'high qualitie' (i. e., a heroic name) in a work called *Polydoron*, mentioned by C. B. Carew in *Notes and Queries*, 3rd Ser., vol. I, p. 266. [*Polydoron* is perhaps the secondary title, no work appears to be known under that name.—L. T. S.]"

The work is, of course, John Done's *Polydoron*, (1631) most remarkable, perhaps, for the persistence with which it has been attributed to Dr. John Donne, dean of St. Paul's. At the cited passage in *Notes and Queries* is the quotation

¹ Second edition (1879), edited by Lucy Toulmin Smith for the New Shakspeare Society, p. 247.

which should undoubtedly have found a place in the *Centurie of Prayse* or in the *300 Fresh Allusions*. Mr. Carew spoke of *Polydoron* as "a curious miscellany of apophthegms and table-talk, evidently the work of one of Shakespeare's contemporaries." As his copy of the book lacked the title-page, he asked if any one could name the author. There was no response until twenty years later (1882) the subject was revived² by another correspondent who knew the name of John Done, but sought information about him. Dr. Augustus Jessopp answered vaguely that he believed Done was an obscure school-master employed by the booksellers, but he was unable to verify this impression.

Whoever Done was, he remained sufficiently obscure to escape the notice of the editors of the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Besides the *Polydoron*, the British Museum possesses the first edition (1633) of his translation of *The Ancient History of the Septuagint* by Aristeas, an officer of the court of Ptolemy Philadelphia, and a revised edition published in 1685. Mr. Edmund Gosse³ observed that this volume was likewise attributed to Donne, though the preface shows that it was written two years after the death of the Dean of St. Paul's.

Lowndes⁴ accredited the *Polydoron* to Dr. Donne and has been followed blindly ever since by booksellers and collectors. The error has even crept into the admirable *Auction Prices of Books* (1905), recently published⁵ by Mr. Luther S. Livingston.

JOHN LOUIS HANEY.

Central High School, Philadelphia.

² *Notes and Queries*, 6th Ser., VI, pp. 47, 95.

³ *Life and Letters of John Donne* (1899), II, p. 306.

⁴ *Bibliographers' Manual*, ed. Bohn, p. 661.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 35.

THE SIMPLIFICATION OF FRENCH ORTHOGRAPHY. II.

II. THE DECISIONS OF THE FRENCH ACADEMY.¹

What strikes one most is the deliberately negative attitude towards the conclusions reached by the "Commission."

The "Commission" was in favor of matching, as much as circumstances will allow, pronunciation to orthography. But the Academy "repousse le principe même sur lequel s'appuie et d'où est comme partie la commission . . . rapprocher le plus possible . . . la parole écrite de la parole parlée."²

The "Commission," although—or better because—composed of great scholars, is ready to give up the etymological principle as being of no particular value for spelling. The Academy, on the contrary, "se confesse très attachée à l'orthographe étymologique."

The "Commission" thinks that the much talked about "physionomie des mots" is a myth.³ The Academy wishes to keep the idea that each word has its "individualité" and, as the poet says, is "un être vivant."

Besides, the French Academy adds a few reasons of its own to justify rigid conservatism, reasons which are either bad or childish. E. g.,

¹ The committee elected by the Academy to consider the "Rapport de la Commission" was composed as follows: G. Boissier, Fr. Coppée, A. Mézières, F. Brunetière, J. M. de Hérédia, A. Theuriet, E. Ollivier, M. de Vogüé, E. Lavis, H. Houssaye, G. Hanotaux and E. Faguet.

² A sensible theory, indeed! Why have we a "parole écrite" anyway, if not to represent as faithfully as possible the "parole parlée"?

³ It is really a myth, even as regards poetry. We read all French classics in modern orthography, and yet we are not disturbed in the least; but we are when we take the original. M. Renard has recently recalled the fact that Brunetière, the almost violent champion of the "physionomie des mots," has edited Bossuet in modern orthography—a proof that the argument was invented for the special purpose of defeating reform. M. Havet remarks that V. Hugo's first verses were published by their author in three different orthographies, first according to the spelling of the beginning of the nineteenth century, then with the changes brought to the dictionary of the Academy in 1835, then again in 1878.

1, 4: "L'Académie croit que la raison la plus forte qui s'oppose à l'adoption des réformes proposées est encore le bouleversement qu'elles apporteraient dans toutes les habitudes des Français . . ."⁴

Or this, that it would hamper the work of French writers: "Il est incontestable, au moins, qu'un changement profond dans l'orthographe embarrasserait les écrivains et leur serait une peine en quelque sorte matérielle qui pourrait aller jusqu'à les paralyser dans leurs travaux . . ."⁵ [!!!]

Or again, reforms now would be likely to open the door for further reforms, which by all means must be avoided.⁵

Of course it would. This is exactly the question whether it is not wise to enter resolutely the path of reform. And the Academy lacks consistency, both in theory and in practice, when after this it accepts some reforms, as we will see soon. Why, if they hold such theories, why not at least stand by them and try to enforce them? Simply because they do not care to be looked upon as the enemies of progress; in other words, because they are afraid of public opinion.

The bulk of their report is made out of thirty-two "*L'Académie repousse . . .*" or "*L'Académie rejette . . .*," and fourteen "*L'Académie accepte . . .*" Here are the fourteen paragraphs of acceptance:

1° *Déjà* (pour *déjà*).

2° *Chute* (pour *châte*), *joute* (pour *joâte*), *otage* (pour *ôtage*), modifications que l'Académie a déjà fait entrer dans son dictionnaire; et de plus *assidument* (pour *assidément*), *dévouement* (pour

⁴ M. Havet answers very well: "J'admire l'égoïsme de tant de mes concitoyens qui se hâtent de décider au nom de leur vague agacement d'une minute, et qui, sans remords, se dispensent de peser les deux intérêts séculaires de l'avenir, j'entends l'intérêt humain et l'intérêt français." (*Revue Bleue*, 11 mars, 1905.)

⁵ As an example of such miserable arguments in the part of the Report containing the examination of the work of the "Commission," read this (II, 8): "Elle [l'académie] a rejeté la proposition d'écrire *fame* pour *femme*. Elle croit qu'il n'est pas mauvais de conserver un souvenir de l'étymologie, et aussi que si le mot *fame* (réputation) n'existe plus, le mot *fameux* existe, qui semblerait être l'adjectif du substantif *fame* et paraîtrait dès lors signifier *fémmin*; et l'on pourrait en dire autant du mot *famélique*." As Clédat says, this "mérite d'être enchassé."

dévotement ou dévouement), *crucifiment* (pour *crucifiement* ou *crucifiment*).

3° *Ile* (pour *île*), *flute* (pour *flûte*), *maitre* (pour *maître*), *naître* (pour *naître*), *traître* (pour *traître*), *croute* (pour *croûte*), *voute* (pour *voûte*) et autres mots où l'accent circonflexe ne sert qu'à rappeler l's étymologique.

4° Elle admet que l'on écrive *confidentiel* ou *confidenciel* et les adjectifs analogues, c'est à dire ceux dont le substantif est en *ence* ou en *ance*.

5° Elle accepte l'identification orthographique de *différent* et *différend*, de *fond* et *fonds*, de *appats* et *appas*, en ce sens que l'on écrirait : "Un *différent* s'est élevé ; un *fond* de terre ; la *retraite* a pour vous des *appats*."

6° Elle accepte qu'on écrive, *ad libitum*, *emmitoufler* et *emmitoufler*, *emmener* et *emmener*, *emmailloter* et *emmailloter*, et autres mots analogues où l'n, rencontrant m, est devenue m.

7° Elle accepte *ognon* pour *oignon*.

8° Elle ne voit aucun inconvénient à ce que l'on écrive *pied* ou *pié*.

9° Elle accepte que les sept substantifs en *ou* qui prennent un *x* au pluriel : *bijou*, *caillou*, *chou*, *genou*, *hibou*, *joujou*, *pou*, rentrent dans la règle générale et prennent un *s* au pluriel.

10° Elle accepte *échèle* au lieu de *échelle*, conformément à la prononciation et à l'étymologie.

11° Elle a décidé de régulariser l'orthographe des mots venant de *carrus* en écrivant *charriot* par deux r, comme s'écrivent tous les autres mots dérivés de *carrus*.

12° Elle est disposée, en examinant chaque cas, à ne pas s'opposer à la suppression de l'h dans les mots, dérivés du grec, où se rencontre la combinaison *rh*.

13° De même, notamment, pour les mots de création scientifique, elle aura pour tendance de favoriser l'i plutôt que l'y.

14° Elle est favorable à la proposition d'écrire *sizain* comme on écrit *dizain* et *dizaine* ; elle estime que l'on pourrait étendre cette réforme à *dizième* et *sizième* (au lieu de *dixième* et *sixième*) par conformité avec *onzième* et *douzième*.

Everywhere the reluctance of the Academy to yield is apparent. And yet they seem to be extremely anxious to look very generous ; they write as if everybody was to be a dupe of their solemn academic style. There are fourteen points where

reform is accepted, but not one of them really amounts to anything.

See No. 1 : The "Commission" proposed to do away with all the grave accents over *a* ; the Academy gravely makes a paragraph of acceptance for one whole word : *déjà*.

See No. 2 : Out of the six words which they propose to change, three were spelled this way long ago ; but apparently it swells the list of concessions.

No. 9 : The "Commission" proposed that all the plurals in *x* be from now on in *s*. The Academy reforms the six in *ou* only.

Then again, Nos. 7, 10 and 11 . . .

There is in the whole way of proceeding a painful lack of dignity. The Academy behaves like a nervous woman who will make a tremendous fuss about a trifle, while ignoring the really momentous question. Paul Meyer, among many others, pointed out those inconsistencies "que si oignon devient ognon, moignon doit logiquement devenir mognon : en limitant la réforme au seul oignon, on ne fait que créer une exception nouvelle !—que si échelle devient échèle, conformément au latin *scala*, où il n'y a qu'un *l*, il n'y a pas de raison de continuer à écrire quelle, telle, puisqu'il n'y a qu'un *l* dans *qualis* et *talis*."

It is difficult, even for antagonists of the reform, not to feel like M. Clédat, who begins his pamphlet with these words : "L'Académie vient de faire magistralement la démonstration de son incurable incompétence en matière de grammaire et d'orthographe." The word "incurable" may possibly be omitted ; but it is the only one.

III. THE ARTICLE OF FAGUET.

Faguet had been selected by the committee of the French Academy to act as secretary. But he is an independent thinker and the ultra-conservative attitude of the Academy did not altogether please him. He did not want the public to believe that the report composed by him represented his personal opinion. Therefore, he accepted to give his own ideas, at first in the *Gaulois* of Febr. 18, and then with more details in *La Revue* of March 1, 1905. The argumentation in the latter was so completely different from that of his official writing that it has become the opinion of many that

Faguet had really mystified both the public and the Academy, and that his official report from alpha to omega was nothing but a daring joke. The writer feels very much inclined to share this view. Faguet begins, it is true, by approving the Academy in refusing to consider the principle of phonetic spelling—because, he says, the pronunciation is not fixed and it is a fixed orthography which is wanted. Moreover, he considers the concessions of the Academy—he calls them “concessions”—as “non sans quelque importance.” The chief part of his article remains none the less devoted to the refutation of the academic report, which he had himself drawn. Let us pick out three of the most striking passages :

As an Academician secretary, he opposes the simplification of certain words on the ground that confusion would arise between such terms different in meaning but spelt alike. “Elle [l’Académie] a rejeté *cors* (pour *corps*), *ni* (pour *nid*), *las* (pour *lacs*), *doit* (pour *doigt*) . . . , considérant qu’il n’y a pas d’exemples qui fussent mieux choisis pour montrer la difficulté et les périls d’un système de simplification qui aboutirait à une foule de confusions, c. à. d. au contraire même de la simplification véritable, et qui ferait qu’on devrait écrire “son *doit* *doit* être coupé,” “il *vint* *vint* fois,” “*ni ni ni* fleurs,” etc. And a few lines above : “Elle a rejeté la proposition d’écrire *fan*, *pan*, *tan* (pour *faon*, *paon*, *taon*). Il y aurait amphibologie . . . entre *pan* (animal) et *pan* (terme de polythéisme) et *pan* (morceau) et *pan* onomatopée exclamative . . . ”

Faguet answers, laughing at his own words : “L’auteur du rapport de la Commission académique triomphe de ce que si *paon* s’écrivait *pan*, il y aurait une confusion entre *pan* oiseau, *pan* de mur, *pan* personnage mythologique, et *pan* ! onomatopée. Mais mon ami (il m’est permis de le traiter familièrement) c’est précisément par ce qu’il y a déjà trois *pan* entre lesquels on ne fait aucune confusion qu’il n’y en aura pas davantage entre quatre *pan* ayant quatre sens . . . ”

Faguet, the secretary, writes with regard to etymology : “L’Académie française se déclare très attachée à l’orthographe étymologique . . . Le moment est-il bien choisi pour travailler à effacer le souvenir des origines de notre langue ? Non, sans doute, car cette parenté de notre langue avec la langue latine . . . fait plus facilement com-

prendre notre langue aux gens bien élevés de tous les pays.” To which Faguet, as a private man, answers : “Sainte Beuve a répondu d’avance assez à propos . . . : Cette raison qu’il faut garder aux mots tout leur appareil afin de maintenir leur étymologie est parfaitement vaine ; car pour une lettre de plus ou de moins, les ignorants ne sauront pas mieux reconnaître l’origine du mot, et les hommes instruits la reconnaîtront toujours.”

Faguet, the Academician, borrows Brunetière’s often quoted words in order to preserve the “physionomie des mots.” “Ceux qui considèrent une langue comme une œuvre d’art continueront de croire que dans une langue élaborée par cinq ou six siècles de culture esthétique, le mot a sa valeur en soi, qu’il a son “individualité,” qu’il est selon l’expression du poète “un être vivant” ; qu’on le mutile donc en simplifiant l’orthographe . . . que la *scintillation* des étoiles s’éteindrait, si l’on écrivait désormais *cintilation* . . . ” Now, here is what Faguet, the independent thinker, has to say : “Quant à la “physionomie des mots” elle m’est absolument indifférente. C’est l’argument à la portée des simples, des très simples, et c’est pour cela qu’il est celui dont les journalistes ont abusé et presque le seul dont ils se soient servis . . . Seulement la physionomie des mots a changé dix fois depuis trois cents ans et si l’on s’était arrêté à la physionomie des mots on écrirait encore *cholère* et *caractère* et *chymie* et *avocat* et *escole* et *abysme* et *argille* et *bienfaicteur* et *détrôner*. La vérité est qu’on s’habitue très vite à la physionomie des mots. Qui est-ce qui regrette *françois*. Il n’est écrit *français* officiellement que depuis soixante-dix ans. Qui est-ce qui regrette *phthysie* et *rhythme* ? Ils ne sont écrit plus simplement que depuis vingt-cinq ans . . . Tenez, je me rappelle *hermite*. Il n’avait pas le sens commun ; car *h* indique un esprit rude” dans le mot grec et il n’y a pas le moindre esprit rude dans le mot grec. Mais quand il s’est agi de l’écrire normalement et simplement à la fois *ermite* il y eut soulèvement. Il y eut des gens pour dire, non sans esprit du reste (je ne me rappelle plus qui, mais mon père me l’a souvent raconté). “Oh ! la physionomie des mots ! On le voit, cet *hermite* portant devant lui son long bâton et s’appuyant sur lui . . . ”—“Pas mal ! Seulement ç’a n’a pas le sens commun.”

Faguet thinks that, in fact, any kind of orthog-

raphy will require five or six years of study for children and that the best reform will not save more than three or four weeks. He sees two chief difficulties which can be remedied easily in French spelling: the Greek words and the double consonants. He concludes his discussion: "Je propose donc la francisation de tous les mots grecs et la suppression de toutes les lettres doubles (sauf les quelques cas où il me serait démontré qu'une suppression de lettre double crée une véritable et dangereuse confusion entre deux mots, ce qui me sera démontré bien rarement."

(This is also the opinion of O. Gréard, and was accepted by many people, amongst others by the powerful "Ligue française de l'enseignement," headed by its president, F. Buisson.)

The decisions of the French Academy raised a general outcry, especially on the part of the scholars. P. Meyer, Brunot, Clédat and others have spoken very serious words. The "beau-rôle" does not remain with the Academy.

The most embarrassed person in France, in the meanwhile, was the Minister of Public Instruction. He was urged to simply ignore the opposition of the Academy. This, however, was not possible, his predecessor having himself asked for the advice of the celebrated body. All that remained for him to do was to create once more a "Commission" to adjust the differences and make out a list of the simplifications that ought to be made in taking into account both the report of the first Commission and that of the Academy. M. Bienvenu Martin, the following Minister, was then to act on their recommendations. At least it seems so from the words spoken by him at a meeting of the "Conseil Supérieur d'instruction publique" last fall. This will be, he says, "moins une commission d'étude qu'une commission de coördination et de proposition ayant pour mission spéciale de préparer les solutions définitives sur lesquelles le conseil aura à se prononcer dans sa prochaine session."

The members are: Messrs. Brunot, Clairin, Croiset, Faguet, Gasquet, Hémon, Paul Meyer, Rabier.

We wish to add two remarks.

The first is with regard to the position of the

Academy in the debates. What must—or rather what can be—their attitude? Few people seem to realize it, and generally err both in praise or in condemnation. It is an awkward position, and the Academy is only in part responsible for it. At the beginning, in the seventeenth century, it was decided that the select assembly would simply *constater l'usage*, but never *dictate* or *impose*. Over and over again, to the present day, the Academy has publicly declared that it would remain true to this principle. From an abstract point of view, this is well and good. But practically it proves infeasible. The function of *constater l'usage* carried with it a much greater influence for the Academy than was consistent with the original policy; and the Academy, even if it had tried to prevent it, could not help it if the public chose to consider its *constatations* as "orders." Ultimately it came to this, that now the public regulates itself on the Academy, instead of the Academy regulating itself upon the public. Innovations are bound to become very great exceptions; the Academy would not make them because it is not within its attributions, and the public would not, because the standard language is that of the Academy. Since education has become compulsory and the necessity of uniformity in spelling has grown still more important, there is no hope left. Now, as said above, the Academy is not responsible for the fact that the public accepts its decisions as absolutely authoritative, but the Academy is certainly responsible for accepting this situation and doing nothing to remedy it. On the contrary, they seem perfectly satisfied to act the part of tyrants at the expense of the language. It is perfectly right that the people be not asked to propose reforms; but, the Academy should make it a point to consult experts, to invite their coöperation so as to prevent French from getting to the state of a dead language. Exactly the contrary is done. And not only is there no example of the Academy ever asking such coöperation, but when, on the request of the Minister of Public Instruction, those scholars readily tender their excellent services, the Academy assumes an offended air, thanks them for their "good intentions" and pretends to make concessions which really amount to nothing.

Our second remark is of an even more general character. Concerning the reform itself, the con-

clusion which imposes itself after reading the "Rapport" Meyer is that, in order to do things right, now, after several centuries of a poor understanding of the needs of the language, would mean a very, very thorough reform—no less than the reform of the alphabet would really do. This, of course, makes one pause and think. Is this wise? is it possible?—We do not wish to answer, but only mention a solution that has been proposed. The chief purpose of the reform is to render French easier, and the reason why it ought to be made easier is, first of all, because it is a useful language for all sorts of people. There is now on foot a strong movement to introduce in the world an *international language*, which will by no means replace the other languages, but take in each country the place of foreign languages for practical purposes. Instead of learning French, German, Italian, Spanish, an English-speaking person, for instance, with only one tongue besides his own, will be able to get along in those four or more countries. Now, if a language like this was to make its way in this world, the reforms of spelling in the different languages would at once lose a great deal of importance; in other words, all the characteristic and historical features of the national tongues, which seem as many beauties to most of us, would at once be safe against so-called improvements, which hurt so much the feelings of all those attached to traditions. Then, only those would study other national languages than their own, who did it for the sake of higher culture. (The time taken on the modern languages considered as a mere tool for practical purposes, would at the same time allow us to render to the classical languages, Latin and Greek, their old place in our college courses—a place which otherwise is bound to become smaller and smaller.)

Of course, in America, where the movement for the introduction of the I. L. (International Language) has not found any echo as yet, this may seem rather an odd idea. But for those who have watched its progress in France, in Germany and in England for the last two or three years—both as a question of principle (see *Conturat*: "Rapport sur les progrès de l'idée de la langue internationale" au Congrès international de Philosophie, Genève, 1904) and as a practical solution of innumerable problems of our time (see all the dis-

cussions aroused in Europe after the Esperantist Congress in Boulogne, last September), things look very different. Ideas are gaining ground fast in our days, and the time may come sooner than many of us expect, when the attitude of men like Michel Bréal will be the proper attitude, namely: be conservative in questions of national languages (orthography, and others), but hasten the time of better understanding among people of all nations by the adoption of a world language.

ALBERT SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

BEOWULF, 62, AGAIN.

It is perhaps rather late in the day to object to the conclusions of Professor Klaeber in his notes¹ on l. 62 of *Beowulf*, but I have only kept silent because I had other important things on hand. I think that Professor Klaeber, unintentionally, has somewhat misrepresented matters; and if I may be pardoned for adding a few more straws to the already heavy burden of this poor line, I should like to make the attempt to straighten some things out. It may be that one or two of my additions may have a more general interest than my title would seem to promise.

I hope that Professor Klaeber will not take offense if I suggest that he has been at times a trifle overconfident: perhaps in my first note² on this line I was, in the same way, a little at fault,—however, I think he has sinned more than I. The points at issue are: the facts concerning the erasure in this line, the meaning of them, and the part played by *hyrde ic* in Old English literature.

Professor Klaeber agrees with me that there is an erasure after *cwen*, but according to him we are not to draw any conclusions from it. "The scribe had made a mistake, which he corrected. (!) That is all the erasure tells us. Whether that unlucky scribal blunder which has caused so much headache to modern scholars,

¹ *Modern Language Notes*, xx, p. 11; *Modern Philology*, III, p. 243.

² *Modern Language Notes*, xix, 121.

occurred before or after *elan ewen*, cannot be learned from it. Nor do we know whether the (first) scribe of our *Beowulf* copy actually committed or merely transmitted it. Besides, can we really be sure that what he erased was not simply a blot of ink?" He also says that no letter underneath *heaðo* can be made out with certainty; and to my suggestion that *hyrde ic* possibly implies uncertainty of information on the composer's part, he returns a very decided and, I think, dogmatic negative answer. His only justification is the two-edged remark that "The stylistic and metrical functions of *hyrde ic* are clearly seen in line 2163" and he quotes the line. So much appears in his article in *Modern Language Notes*, xx, p. 11. In *Modern Philology*, III, p. 243 f., he again takes up *hyrde ic* and treats it as a *gefrægn* formula. He says: "Now the phrase *hyrde ic* serves here (*Beo.* 62) practically as poetic formula of transition equal to 'further,' exactly as in line 2163, where the account of the presentation of the four gifts is connected in the same way with (its continuation, that is) the report of the donation of the horses" . . . He then quotes the line, refers the reader to his note in *Modern Language Notes*, and adds another reference, to line 2172.

This summer in the British Museum I took occasion to examine carefully this page of the *Beowulf* MS. I found there what my previous study of several copies of the facsimile had shown me, namely, that there has been an erasure, that it was the erasure of a word, and that there are the indisputable remains of an *s* just after the *o* of *heaðo*. But, I think it especially noteworthy that all copies of the facsimile are not equally efficient in what they disclose of the MS. If one takes two copies and compares them page for page he will find considerable variation in the plainness of the readings. The *s* just mentioned can be seen in the MS. itself. Both I and the attendant in the Manuscript work-room identified it. It can generally be seen in copies of the facsimile, and I think there are some specimens that show it even plainer than the original MS. But this variation is to me noteworthy. It seems rather remarkable that the mere difference in the strength of an impression can bring so much more out in one copy than in another. It suggests that by proper mani-

pulation a MS. photograph may be made to give plainer readings than its original. Also, the fact that Zupitza has not mentioned this particular erasure in his edition suggests that it is a pity that he has not edited the autotype more thoroughly. It has been pointed out to me that there are several other erasures and suspicious places that he has said nothing about.

But to return now more narrowly to our subject, Professor Klaeber says that 'the phrase *hyrde ic* certainly does not point to the composer's uncertainty of information.' His only proof is an assertion about line 2163, which he later strengthens by adding line 2172. He also puts in a counter claim, so to speak, by bringing forward Schücking's suggestion that *hyrde ic* serves here practically as a poetic formula of transition. "The question," he says, "is not what modern logic expects, or subjective criticism declares possible or impossible, but whether such an expression accords with the practice, not to say the laws, of the old style." I agree with Professor Klaeber. This is very good doctrine, quite worthy of being followed. In point of fact, the terms poetic formula and epic formula, as I myself am prepared to prove, are used so loosely that they are practically meaningless. They class together locutions of quite different character; the locutions often mean what they literally say; and sometimes these terms are applied to expressions that are not even stereotyped. Now, what are the facts concerning *hyrde ic*? It occurs but three times in all Old English poetry, always in *Beowulf*. Schücking has tried to obtain a fourth or at least analogous case in the *hyrde we* passage in the *Fates of the Apostles*, line 70, but I think with no success. Such, then, is the extent of the practice mentioned by Professor Klaeber. Now, what are the metrical and stylistic functions of the phrase? First, in all three cases, *hyrde ic* introduces a passage metrically independent of the rest of the poem. In at least two of these cases the material is also logically independent. Let us consider lines 2163 and 2172: they are close neighbors and should be treated together. Their sections follow immediately in succession upon a long speech by Beowulf in which that hero tells of his experiences in the land of Hroðgar, and he closes by offering to Hygelac the treasure he has

received from the son of Healfdene. Several presents are mentioned specifically. "*Bruc calles well!*" Then follows: *Hyrde ic þæt þam fræthrum feower mearas . . . last weardode . . .* that is, another present is mentioned that the author or scribe has heard that Beowulf gave to his lord. 'Thus should a kinsman do,' is the comment. Then he adds a second *hyrde ic* clause, introducing still other presents: *Hyrde ic þæt he þone heals-beah Hygde gesealde . . .* Now, either or both of these passages could easily have been added by any scribe. Much the same, also, can be said for line 62. The material is independent metrically and could have been added by any copyist. Suppose that a previous scribe had accidentally left out a line or two describing the fourth child of Healfdene, then it would not be at all unlikely that our copyist, noticing the omission, would try to supply the defect on the basis of his own probably uncertain information. Nor would it be strange if he became confused in the process. I say all this is possible, and that is all that I have claimed for it at any time.

Let us now take up another line of argument. Professor Klaeber says with reference to the erasure, that it tells us that the scribe had made a mistake which he corrected. Now, surely Professor Klaeber can not have meant this to be taken literally, for if the scribe had corrected his mistake, there would have been none of the "headache" referred to. But that is just the point: the mistake was not corrected. After the word *cwen* everything is peculiar. There is an erasure, a genitive ending in *as*, and a feminine nominative singular ending in *a*,—not to mention logical and metrical difficulties. Before *elan cwen* there is not the slightest internal or direct evidence to show that there is any error. It seems to me that the ms. testimony is thus fairly conclusive. Now, if we should accept Professor Klaeber's suggestion that what the scribe erased was a blot of ink, the ms. testimony is strong enough to be considered proof, because the scribe has shown by erasing just a mere blot that he at least thought there was no mistake before the blot.

Finally, if one does not wish to consider *elan* a woman's name, there is still another way of construing it, as Professor Schofield has suggested to me (it is also noted in Grein's *Sprachschatz*). It

is entirely possible to take *elan* as the genitive of *Ela*, making this the name of the husband, and supplying after *cwen* the name of the wife and the verb *wæs*. The reconstructed line would be type E. Consequently, from either point of view, it is not at all necessary to make an emendation at any other place than after the word *cwen*.

FRANK E. BRYANT.

Cambridge, Mass.

MARLOWE, *DOCTOR FAUSTUS* 13. 106-9.

The lines thus numbered (5. 1. 106-9 of W. Wagner's ed.) in Ward's edition are here quoted from Breymann's edition (1378-81, ed. of 1604):

Brighter art thou then flaming *Jupiter*
When he appeard to haplesse *Semele*;
More louely than the monarke of the skie
In wanton *Arethusas* azurde armes.

The edition of 1616 has (1856-9) only trifling variations: 'appear'd,' 'Monarch of the sky,' '*Arethusa's*,' 'azure.' The edition of 1616 is the only one that has 'azure'; those of 1619, 1620, 1624, and 1631 have 'azurd' or 'azur'd.' 'Skye' is found in the editions of 1609, 1619, 1620, and 1631.

Wagner comments: 'Marlowe's mythology appears to be at fault here. *Arethusa* is never mentioned as the beloved of "the monarch of the sky," whoever he may be—Jupiter or Apollo. . . . *Azur'd* appears to be said in reference to *Arethusa* being a sea-nymph.' In his Critical Commentary, p. 98, he says: 'Is there any corruption in *Arethusa*?'

Ward refers to Wagner's comment, and adds, 'It would be a sorry attempt to spoil this lovely line by any crude conjecture. Van der Velde thinks that "the monarch of the sky" means the sky itself, which is mirrored in the spring *Arethusa*, and thus lends it an azure hue. *Arethusa* was a general name given by the Greeks to springs, and Marlowe may therefore be excused for using the name to signify "water-nymph" in general. F. V. Hugo has not improved the meaning of the passage by translating "the monarch of the sky" "le roi des mers."—If Marlowe was thinking of

the reflection of the sky, or of the character of Arethusa as a sea-nymph, the epithet "azur'd" has a special significance here; compare *The Tempest* 43:

'Twixt the green sea and the azur'd vault;

but the word may be merely used as an epithet of the veins of the skin, as in *The Rape of Lucrece* 419, and in *Friar Bacon* 1. 83 . . .

It is not easy to see what authority Ward has for saying that 'Arethusa was a general name given by the Greeks to springs.' It is a particular name given by the Greeks to certain individual springs, some seven or so. While Marlowe would not 'therefore be excused for using the name to signify "water-nymph" in general,' it is yet quite possible that he may have confounded Arethusa with some other water-nymph. According to one account, Arethusa was the mother of Abas by Poseidon (Hyginus, *Fab.* 157; Stephanus of Byzantium s. v. 'Αβάρης). If we accepted this—and the union of Arethusa with one of the greater gods is not otherwise recorded—the only emendation necessary would be to change Marlowe's 'skie' to 'sea.' However, this legend is obscure, and perhaps doubtful, so that Marlowe is not likely to have used it. If we attach any importance to it, it shows that Poseidon was conceived of, not only as the god of ocean, but also, on occasion, as a god of fountains and rivers (cf. Preller, *Gr. Myth.* 1. 457), as κρηνοῦχος and νυμφαγέτης (Cornutus, *Nat. Deor.* 22). This leads to the suspicion that Marlowe may have been thinking of a much more famous legend, one which was frequently illustrated in ancient art, that of Poseidon and Amy-mone. It will be observed that 'Amy-mone' fulfils the metrical requirements of the line, and that her story, being fully related in Latin, was accessible to all the poets of the Renaissance.

Hyginus has two versions of the legend. He thus begins in *Fab.* 169 (ed. Schmidt, pp. 31-2, with changes in punctuation and capitalization): 'Amy-mone, Danaï filia, dum studiose in silva venatur, Satyrum jaculo percussit. Eam Satyrus voluit violare; illa Neptuni fidem imploravit. Quo Neptunus cum venisset, Satyrum abegit, et ipse cum ea concubuit, ex quo conceptu nascitur Nauplius. Id in quo loco factum est, Neptunus dicitur fuscina percussisse terram, et inde aquam

profluxisse, qui Lernæus fons dictus est et Amy-monium flumen.'

There follows immediately a second form of the story, as follows: 'Amy-mone, Danaï filia, missa est a patre aquam petitem ad sacrum faciendum, quæ dum quærit lassitudine obdormiit. Quam Satyrus violare voluit; illa Neptuni fidem imploravit. Quod cum Neptunus fuscina in Satyrum misisset, illa se in petram fixit. Satyrum Neptunus fugavit; qui cum quæreret in solitudine a puella, illa se aquatum missam esse dixit a patre. Quam Neptunus compressit, ex qua compressione natus est Nauplius; pro quo beneficium ei tribuit jussitque ejus fuscina de petra educere. Quæ cum eduxisset, [et] tres silani sunt secuti. Qui ex Amy-mones nomine Amymonius fons appellatus est; hic autem fons Lernæus est postea appellatus.'

Apollodorus (2. 1. 4) exhibits familiarity with the second version, but varies from it in some particulars. Thus, he says: 'Danaus came to Argos,¹ where Gelanor, the king then reigning, abdicated the throne in his favor. At that time the country was suffering from drought, for Poseidon had caused the springs to dry up, being incensed at Inachus, because he had proclaimed that the land belonged to Athene. When Danaus sent his daughters to obtain water, one of them, Anymone, while on this quest, shot an arrow at a stag, which struck a sleeping satyr.' The rest of the story conforms to the account of Hyginus.

Propertius (2. 26. 45-50, ed. Baehrens) alludes to this legend, and from him Marlowe may have learned to couple the names, as lovers, of Neptune and Jupiter:

Sed non Neptunus tanto crudelis amori,
Neptunus fratri par in amore Jovi:
Testis Amy-mone, latices dum ferret, in Argis
Compressa, et Lernæ pulsa tridente palus;
Jam deus amplexu votum persolvit, at illi
Aurea divinas urua profudit aquas.

The beauty of Amy-mone is suggested by the remarks in Lucian, *Sea-Gods* 6. Triton says (tr. Fowler): 'There is such a pretty girl coming to Lerna for water every day; I don't know that I ever saw a prettier.' And Poseidon: 'A charm-

¹ It is worth noting that Arethusa, too, had a fountain in Argos (*Schol. Od.* 17. 408).

ing child; the dawn of loveliness.' Poseidon soothes her by saying: 'Don't be frightened; no harm shall be done to you. Come, you shall have a fountain called after you; it shall spring up in this very place, near the waves; I will strike the rock with my trident.'

If, then, we should read,

More louely then the monarke of the sea
In wanton Amymones azurde armes,

we should have Marlowe reflecting a well-known legend in a line whose loveliness has perhaps not been wholly spoiled. 'Wanton' may still mean (Schmidt, *Shak. Lex.*) 'playful, sportive, frolicsome,' in accordance with Wagner's interpretation. 'Monarke of the sea' might easily have been derived, say, from Ovid, *Met.* 4. 797, *pelagi rector*, where another love-adventure of Neptune is related. As for 'azurde armes,' one is likely to do better, with Ward, to think of *Lucr.* 418-9:

With more than admiration he admires
Her azure veins, her alabaster skin,

than to go off in search of the Lat. *cæruleus*² as an epithet of water-deities. Other citations from Shakespeare, to the same effect, are *Lucr.* 407, 440; *Ven. and Adon.* 482; *Ant. and Cleo.* 2. 5. 29; *Cymb.* 2. 2. 22 (cf. Shelley's 'azure veins,' *Damon* 1. 14; *Q. Mab.* 1. 14; and Keats' 'azure-lidded,' *Eve of St. Agnes* 262).

Let us now attempt to give the reasons for considering these two emendations, 'sea' for 'skie,' and 'Amymone's' for 'Arethusaes':

1. The form of *Doctor Faustus* which we possess is not the original one (Ward, p. lxxxiv). 'We have the probability of three, and the certainty of two, revisions before the date of the printing of the play in its first extant edition of 1604. Of these three revisions it is clear that the last, that of 1602, must have contained extensive alterations' (Ward, p. lxxxv). There was therefore opportunity for corruptions to creep in.

2. It is pointless to make a twofold comparison with Jupiter. He would probably not be more lovely in the one case than in the other.

3. If two of the greater gods were to be successively introduced, the propriety of making

Neptune the second is sufficiently evinced by Propertius' lines (cf. also F. V. Hugo's 'roi des mers').

4. In Propertius' lines it is Amymone, and not Arethusa, who is represented as the beloved of Neptune. Arethusa, while not absolutely excluded from consideration, is not likely to have occurred to Marlowe, (1) because the legend of her relation to Neptune is obscure, and (2) because, as Wagner has observed, there is no legend of her connection with either Jupiter or Apollo.

5. 'Azurde' and 'wanton,' however interpreted, would apply as well to Amymone as to Arethusa. In fact, if we attach any importance to Ovid's epithet *frigida*, as applied to Arethusa (*F.* 4. 423), 'wanton' would hardly fit Arethusa.

6. 'Sea' and 'Amymone' would suit the metre.

There remain to be considered the objections against all emendations; but these are too frequently urged to need rehearsal here.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

NOTES ON SHAKESPEARE.

(1) *Mid. Night's Dream* 4. 1. 108-124.

In the *Nation* for June 23, 1904, I commented upon this passage, and gave extended quotations from Markham's *Country Contentments*. What follows is of a supplementary nature.

Other Shakespearean passages worth quoting are these:

T. of Shrew, Ind. 2. 47-8:

The hounds shall make the welkin answer them,
And fetch shrill echoes from the hollow earth.

Tit. And. 2. 3. 17-20:

And, whilst the babbling echo mocks the hounds,
Replying shrilly to the well-tuned horns,
As if a double hunt were heard at once,
Let us sit down and mark their yelping noise.

If the latter, as Cunliffe (*The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*, pp. 69-70) supposes may be the case, is influenced by Seneca, *Hippolytus* 37-38, we may find in the latter an

² Cf. Milton's 'blue-haired deities,' *Com.* 29.

ancient source or parallel, along with Ovid and Virgil. In general, the ancients preferred dogs that were silent, at least till the game was started (thus Oppian, *Cyneg.* 1. 448-9; Grattius, *Cyneg.* 106, 207-210; Lucan, *Phars.* 4. 437-441, and even Seneca, in the lines just preceding those cited above). The Celtic dogs were free of tongue, however, according to Arrian, *Cyneg.*, chap. 3: 'In pursuit these give tongue with a clanging howl like the yelping Carians, who are usually classed with the Cretan dogs.' 'Sometimes, indeed,' Arrian adds, 'they gladden so outrageously, even on a stale trail, that I have rated them for their excessive barking.' An interesting passage is that from Ovid, *Halieut.* 76-9:

Quæ nunc elatis rimantur naribus auras,
Et nunc demisso querunt vestigia rostro,
Et produnt clamore feram, dominumque vocando
Increpitant.

Cf. *Met.* 3. 207 ff.; Virgil, *Georg.* 3. 43-5, 345, 404 ff.

According to 'Stonehenge' (J. H. Walsh), in his treatise, *The Dog*, published in 1859 (pp. 49-50): 'The music of the pack is also much neglected, and most men nowadays prefer even that of "the squeaking bitches" if they give a good gallop, to the full-toned and bell-like tongues, one below the other, which were formerly considered to be a part of the sport, and without which a full cry was not listened to with pleasure. . . . Not having a musical ear myself, I cannot enter into the feelings of those who have.'

Somerville's *The Chase*, published in 1735, seems to owe certain expressions to Markham, and a few to Shakespeare, though much of the poem is no doubt true to the writer's own experience. One of the best is this (1. 278-291):

But above all take heed, nor mix thy hounds
Of different kinds; discordant sounds shall grate
Thy ears offended, and a lagging line
Of babbling curs disgrace thy broken pack.
But if the amphibious otter be thy chase,
Or stately stag, that o'er the woodland reigns;
Or if the harmonious thunder of the field
Delight thy ravished ears; the deep-flewed hound
Breed up with care, strong, heavy, slow, but sure,
Whose ears down-hanging from his thick round head
Shall sweep the morning dew, whose clanging voice
Awake the mountain echo in her cell,
And shake the forests; the bold Talbot kind
Of these the prime, as white as Alpine snows.

Another is this (2. 185-291):

The hunters shout,
The clanging horns swell their sweet-winding notes,
The pack wide-opening lead the trembling air
With various melody; from tree to tree
The propagated cry redoubling bounds,
And winged zephyrs waft the floating joy
Through all the regions near.

A third is (2. 249-251):

Hark! now again the chorus fills; as bells,
Silenced a while, at once their peal renew,
And high in air the tuneful thunder rolls.

Still others are 3. 64-76, 410-413.

The long lips and ears are mentioned by Caius, as translated by Abraham Fleming in 1576 (Arber's *English Garner* 3. 233): 'We may know this kind of dogs [harriers] by their long, large, and bagging lips; by their hanging ears, reaching down both sides of their chaps; and by the indifferent and measurable proportion of their making.' Indeed, the long ears of certain hounds are already noted by Arrian, *Cyneg.*, chap. 5; Nemesianus, *Cyneg.* 113; Callimachus, *Hymn to Artemis* 91; *Cynosoph.*, chap. 4; cf. Paul. ex Fest., p. 231 Müll. 'Stonehenge' (p. 49), discussing the ancient types of English hounds, says: 'Both [the northern and the southern hound], however, were large, bony hounds, with long falling ears, but the southern hounds had absolute dewlaps, or at all events such excessive throatiness as to make them rejected at the present day on that account alone.'

(2) *Romeo and Juliet* 2. 3. 3-4.

These lines run:

And flecked darkness like a drunkard reels
From forth day's path and Titan's fiery wheels.

This is paralleled by Nonnus, *Dionys.* 40. 381-2:

Νύξ μὲν ἀκοντιστῆρι διωκόμενη σέο πυρσῶ
χάζεται ἀστήρικτος;

which may be roughly rendered:

'Night reels away from before the flashes of thy [the sun's] coruscating torch.'

Byron seems to have had the Shakespearean passage in mind when he wrote (*Mazeppa* 545):

I saw the trees like drunkards reel;

but much earlier Drummond of Hawthornden had

written ('Phœbus, arise' 42-43; *Muses' Library* 1. 71):

Night like a drunkard reels
Beyond the hills to shun his flaming wheels.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF CERTAIN SCENES IN GOETHE'S *FAUST*.

II.

If we try to remove the confusion in the chronology of the scenes of the Gretchen tragedy in Goethe's *Faust* by putting an interval between the Valentin scene and the Walpurgisnacht scene, we may meet a difficulty in the expression 'übermorgen' in Mephistopheles' allusion to the approaching witch sabbath. This expression seems to have reference to the following Walpurgisnacht scene, but I think that we must not attach too much value to it as a means of determining the time.

In the first place, indications of date are in the whole drama so vague—except when carrying dramatic significance, as does the introduction of the 'Easter morning'—and the sequence of the scenes is so loose, that an exact specification about a certain date and about the chronological relation between two scenes would appear strangely exceptional. Furthermore, if we take 'übermorgen' literally, the Cathedral scene would have to be placed on the day following the murder. But Gretchen's mind in that scene does not seem to be under the fresh impression of this crime. The death of her mother and that of her brother, both seem to be somewhat remote in her memory. Also, Mephistopheles' words and actions in the two scenes show some incongruity. In the Valentin scene he is filled with 'spring' and the anticipation of the approaching orgy, while in the Walpurgisnacht scene he says that he feels 'winterlich' and is altogether not very enthusiastic about the trip.

I consequently would prefer to think that no reference to the following Walpurgisnacht scene was intended by 'übermorgen.' The Valentin scene is certainly of early origin and apparently

was written before the idea of the actual visit to the Brocken had taken form in the poet's mind. What Mephistopheles says of the Brocken festival was therefore merely intended to characterize in a realistic way the kind of feelings which spring is awakening in him and which he delights to exhibit when he observes the gloomy mood in which Faust is on account of Gretchen's threatening shame. By placing this scene on a very early spring day we may account for Mephistopheles' feelings and still save the conjuncture.

But, even if we take 'übermorgen' literally, we may find a way out of the dilemma. Since the poet is not definite about dates, we do not know the exact time of the beginning of the love story, nor the length of Faust's stay in the forest seclusion—his meditation at the beginning of the scene 'Forest and Cavern' rather suggests nature in the fall. We also do not know how long Gretchen, after having become a mother, has wandered about, nor how long she has been in prison when visited by Faust. We therefore are perfectly justified in assuming that Faust returns in the fall, that the murder of Valentin takes place at the end of April, that Faust, full of remorse, flees, not, however, to the Brocken, but to roam about for a year and to be gradually 'lulled in insipid diversions,' while Gretchen's misfortune takes its course, that after having forgotten his love and the wrong done by him he follows Mephistopheles to the witch sabbath of the following year, that he, in the midst of the orgy, has the vision of the beheaded Gretchen, which makes him find his better self, and that he comes to deliver her from prison just the night before her execution. Gretchen's words in that last scene, 'Mein Freund, so kurz von mir entfernt,' are naturally of no significance regarding the point in question. She has in her insanity lost all idea of time, as is shown by her reference to her people dead long ago, and her misconception about the length of Faust's absence gives all the more poignancy to her words.

If we, accepting the above supposition, attempt to determine the chronology of the scenes, we find:

'Easter Day,' in April.

Second Scene 'Study' and preceding visits of Mephistopheles, in May.

Scenes 'Auerbach's Keller' and 'Witch Kitchen,' in June.

First Gretchen scenes before Faust's forest seclusion, in July, August and September. Scene 'Street,' perhaps in July, first scene 'Marthen's Garden,' in August, other meetings in the garden, in September.

Scene 'Forest and Cavern,' in October.

Second scene 'Marthen's Garden,' some pleasant day in November.

Scene 'At the Well,' in December or January. (Lieschen speaks of spinning, an occupation for winter evenings.)

Now is an interval of several months, during which time Faust sees Gretchen until toward the end of that period her mother dies. Then follow the three scenes of Gretchen's agony :

Scene 'Zwinger,' a short time before the Valentin scene. (Spring flowers are well advanced at that time in South Germany.)

'Valentin' scene, at the end of April.

Scene 'Cathedral,' some time after that.

With Gretchen's swoon at the end of the cathedral scene, ends the first part of the love tragedy. There follows an interval of many months, during which time Gretchen becomes a mother, drowns her child, wanders about, is put in prison, tried and sentenced to death, while Faust roams about and is 'lulled in insipid diversions.' Then follows the second part of the love tragedy :

Scene 'Walpurgisnacht,' on the first of May of the following year.

Scenes 'Dismal Day,' 'Night' and 'Prison,' directly after the 'Walpurgisnacht.'

FRIEDRICH WEHSE.

Prospect Heights School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

NOTES ON PRUDENTIUS.

(1) A HYMN OF WATTS' AND ONE OF PRUDENTIUS'.

Watts' well-known funeral hymn, whose first stanza in the original edition (*Reliquiae Juveniles*, London, 1734, p. 250) is,

Unvail thy Bosom, faithful Tomb,
Take this new Treasure to thy Trust,

And give these sacred Reliques Room
To seek a Slumber in the Dust,

seems somewhat like an echo of Prudentius (*Cath.* 10. 125-8, 133-140) :

Nunc suscipe, terra, fovendum,
Gremioque hunc concipe molli ;
Hominis tibi membra sequestro,
Generoso et fragmina credo.

Tu depositum tege corpus ;
Non inmemor illa requiret
Sua munera Fictor et Auctor,
Proprieque ænigmata vultus.

Veniant modo tempora justa
Cum spem Deus inpleat omnem ;
Reddas patefacta necesse est
Qualem tibi trado figuram.

Julian, *Dict. of Hymnology*, p. 291, speaks of a cento made from this hymn, beginning *Jam mæsta quiesce querela*, and consisting of stanzas 31 (30?), 15, 10-12, 32-36 (31-35?). He says : 'It was for generations a favorite funeral hymn among the Lutherans, and was sung in Latin in some parts of Germany till very recent times. Abp. Trench, in giving st. 31-44 in his *Sac. Lat. Poetry*, speaks of them as the "crowning glory of the poetry of Prudentius." It has been tr. into English direct from the Latin, and also through the German' (but no English translation that he cites is as early as the eighteenth century ; for an apparent exception, see p. 822).

Prudentius' *Cathemerinon* may now be found in the Temple Classics (Latin and English), the translation being made by R. Martin Pope and R. F. Davis.

Watts' hymn has been garbled in the hymn-books. The original of 2³⁻⁴ is :

Can reach the lovely Sleeper here,
And Angels watch her soft Repose.

Of 3³ :

Rest here, fair Saint ; till from his Throne

Of 4⁴ :

She must ascend to meet her Lord.

The reason for the changes made by the compilers of hymn-books is evident.

(2) BROWNING'S *Rabbi Ben Ezra* AND
PRUDENTIUS' *Epilogue*.

The figure of the potter, as applied to the shaping of man, and found near the close of *Rabbi Ben Ezra*, is expressed or suggested by various Biblical texts, such as Isa. 45. 9 ; 64. 8 ; Jer. 18. 1-4 ; Ecclus. 33. 13 ; 38. 29, 30 ; Wisd. 15. 7 ; Rom. 9. 21-23 ; and 2 Tim. 2. 20, 21, the last, perhaps, having special relevance to the poem.

It is interesting to note that the thought of 2 Tim. 2. 20, 21 has been developed by Prudentius in his *Epilogue*. As translated by Mr. R. F. Davis (Temple Classics : *The Hymns of Prudentius*, translated by R. Martin Pope), this portion runs :

The rich man's halls are nobly furnished ;
Therein no nook or corner empty seems ;
Here stands the brazen laver burnished,
And there the golden goblet brightly gleams ;
Hard by some crock of clumsy earthen ware,
Massive and ample lies a silver plate ;
And rough-hewn cups of oak or elm are there
With vases carved of ivory delicate.
Yet every vessel in its place is good,
So be it for the Master's service meet ;
The priceless salver and the bowl of wood
Alike He needs to make His home complete.

Therefore within His Father's spacious hall
Christ fits me for the service of a day,
Mean though I be, a vessel poor and small,—
And in some lowly corner lets me stay.
Lo, in the palace of the King of Kings
I play the earthen pitcher's humble part ;
Yet to have done Him meanest service brings
A thrill of rapture to my thankful heart :
Whate'er the end, this thought will joy afford,
My lips have sung the praises of my Lord.

May Browning have owed something to this passage ?

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

NOTE ON *HAMLET*.

In *Hamlet* IV, iii, the King, apostrophising the King of England, says :—"Thou mayst not coldly set Our sovereign process." The commentators are bothered by this phrase, but no one has any-

thing plausible to suggest. Pope, in his arbitrary fashion, changes it to "let." Mason and the Clarendon editors consider it equivalent to "set at nought." But to strain "set a process" until it means "set a process at nought," is, to my thinking, to crack the wind of the poor phrase.

I think it should be *sit*, "withstand," "disobey," perhaps from OE. *atsittan*.

The word occurs in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in the forms *atsit*, *asit* (instances in *Oxf. Dict.*), and in the fifteenth as *sit* : "durst scho neuer sit summondis that scho hard him say" (*Rauf Coilzear*, 99) ; "He durst not sit anys my summondis" (Dunbar, *Twa Mariit Wemen*, 319). It was in use in Shakespeare's time, as we may see in Donne, *Serm.* cl, where we have the identical phrase, "sit a process," for "disobey a command." "God turns their rivers into blood : Pharaoh *sits that process*."

The collocation of the phrases "sit summons" and "sit a process" suggests a legal use of the word.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

SOME RECENT FRENCH PLAYS.

IV.

We have seen in *Notre Jeunesse* a light comedy where the old habit of pleasing by froth is confused—and not harmonized—with a desire to conform to the standard of the Théâtre Français by throwing in a dash of situation and streaks of character ; and in *Les Affaires* a drama of one interest, brutal, actual, unpleasing, but powerful ; we pass to higher ground in the *Duel* of Henri Lavedan.

This play was first performed in April, 1905, and Paris was prompt to award it a deserved admiration. Its author, an academician, was previously known by his *Prince d'Aurec* and his *Marquis de Priola*.

In *Le Duel* we are transported to a realm of lofty ideality ; we see character as it may be rendered noble, and high human action as it may be enfolded, permeated with spiritual essences. These souls are not finely moved but to fine issues. Yet

there is not a shade of dogma, of morality in the limited sense, of art-destroying didacticism. Nor is the realm so remote, so abstract, that we move confused amid unreal fancies and symbols. Here is the dramatist's first triumph. He has clothed each idea in living flesh; and their conflict is very human action. He has conveyed the universal in the particular; he has sought what is most permanent in actuality. The interest is at the same time psychological and scenic.

The play, as its title implies, figures forth a struggle, a contest. But the strife is fought with no material arms, upon no limited mundane field; the forces of personality, of thought and feeling are the contestants; and the battle rages in a woman's heart.

It is a manifold conflict. First and most obviously it is a duel between the Dr. Morey and the Abbé Daniel who combat, the one for the body, the other for the soul of the Duchesse de Chailles. But into what series and convolutions of strife is this apparently simple thesis elaborated!

There is between the Doctor and the Duchess, as varying poles of sympathy and antagonism, the natural duel of the sexes. There is, from the introduction of the Bishop Boland as personifying the Church, the earliest hint of discord, in the discussion between him and the Doctor.

So are the characters set in opposition. And when these contests are transmuted into symbols, it would seem that all the army of ideas takes part. If it is primarily a modern war between science and religion as illustrated in the two brothers, the one a sceptic, the other a pietist; it is also a war of sacred and profane love, or, as one has put it, a war between the love of religion and the religion of love, around the figure of the Duchess; it is a war of the Christian and the Pagan ideal, of the spirit and the flesh, heaven and hell, from the Abbé's viewpoint; from the Doctor's it is a war between reason and unreason, between healthy human happiness and a sickly mysticism. In the Duchess, it is a war first between duty and the individual right, and later between her love for the Doctor, and her admiration, deepening into love, for the Abbé. In the Doctor, it is a war between his love for truth, and a certain stifled idealism shown in his passion for the Duchess. In the Abbé, we have at the

last a conflict between his love for her soul and his love for herself.

Finally—and this is crucial—besides her own, all these battles are fought over again in the mind, in the heart of the disturbed and sorrowful Duchess.

It is, I think, in the analysis, and then in the harmonizing, the centralization of these somewhat bewildering *motifs*, in displaying, while subduing them, that the playwright has shown the highest mastery. Let us see the development.

The scene opens in the sanatorium of Doctor Morey. He is a distinguished alienist and has under his charge the broken and debilitated body of the Duc de Chailles, a *roué*, a victim of the morphine habit. The Duchess, with her life thus clouded, is spending her days in the Doctor's hospital, nursing her husband, despairing of her own individual happiness. She is "*vouée au malheur*"; her cradle was rocked between two coffins; her disillusionment as to the Duke has been of the bitterest. Yet her pessimism is without rancor, and the noble harmony and charm of her character shows best in sorrow.

The Doctor appears as an "*homme de bien*," excellent in his calling, constant to his standard of saving humanity's waste; but unattractive and ungracious; a man of hatred and no loves; a positivist without breadth, a free-thinker without real tolerance; a peculiar type of the so-called scientific spirit in what we may hope is a transient and not universal form. He cannot see but that his mind is the measure of all things. He assumes that the universe is arranged in one straight line—the line of reason's ray. He discounts all opposition by begging the question—by postulating that scientifically there can be none.

Between these two there are friendly relations, as of people who see each other every day. We are treated with mutual confidences, and the personal note is insistently struck. The Duchess recurs to her earlier history, declares her friendlessness and her calm despair. The Doctor would be sympathetic, but in his questions he has the air of diagnosing her case. Has she religion? No! That is good. Neither has he. Her manifested incredulity does not shock him, since he is emancipated from the old ideas of femininity. The statement of the whole situation follows: "*Rap-*

pelez-vous ceci, madame. Il ne faut pas se mettre dans la main du prêtre!" "Et—dans celle du médecin?" "Non plus! Il faut rester soi, indépendant, maître de son esprit et de son cœur." There are no laws, save those of happiness, which is briefly—love. This to hear does the Duchess seriously incline, though verbally she declares that she will have none of this love, this "fléau du monde." The Doctor is her "admirable ami," the comrade of her affliction, who will now disclose *his* past—and shun these dangerous shoals.

The tête-à-tête is interrupted by the entrance of the old Bishop, the missionary to China, a noble figure, who has lived and suffered for his cause, and has remained kindly, naïve, and sensible, penetrative withal, most direct and unjesuitical in his methods. In a fine scene the Duchess is so wrought upon by the recital of his sufferings that she does him reverence by kissing his hand, thus provoking a gesture of impatience from the jealous Doctor. In this manner she reveals herself, despite her previous declaration of incredulity, as really standing with reluctant feet at the parting of the ways.

From this point the Duel is on. At first it appears only as an amiable passage at words. When the two are left alone, the Bishop quietly taxes Morey with loving the Duchess, and assures him that still she is a believer, an *âme d'Église*.

The Abbé Daniel, however, is the real antagonist. He and the Doctor are represented, somewhat conventionally, as being brothers, who had drifted apart in their widely dissimilar ways of life, and had not seen each other for years. He comes to the sanatorium in search of the Bishop, his old Master, by whom he is catechized and to whom he tells of the estrangement between the brothers, and discloses his own character—how he was pushed to religion by debauch, how he loves God in pagan fashion, from artistic and emotional impulses. But from the beginning he gives a fine impression, this fervent and mystic young Abbé, sincere for all his apologetic dilittanteism, holily conscientious and humanly tender. In filial relations, he presents by far the better figure.

The brothers are now *aux prises*. There is a cold greeting and a perfunctory hand-clasp. The Doctor receives his guest with marked disfavor—

"C'est toi? Tu as à me parler?" He refuses the request to care for the Abbé's parish children, first with the banal excuse that he has not the time. But if the other *will* have it, then he objects to being concerned in Catholic priestly work. What use have these people for his services? Have they not a "docteur Dieu?" Yet, to avoid imputation of meanness, Morey will write out a check.

The second request, more significant, is for an introduction to the Duchesse de Chailles, that she may aid the Abbé in his charities. The Doctor, who would seem to have prevision of the *rap-prochement* between these two, who, at any rate is jealous of clerical influence around the susceptible woman, irritably refuses.

Up to this point, there has been manifested no hate, no personal rivalry between the brothers. There is simply lack of common ground, a conflict of ideals and of professions. The Doctor feels a mixture of anger and pity, "quand je songe à la médiocrité et au néant de ton existence. Tu ne vis pas. Tu ne sers à rien." The other retorts that, on the contrary, his life is all compact of service and movement. Is not the very confessional, judged so restricted, the place where one learns all, where the human heart is disclosed in its strongest and deepest struggles? And the situation is finally posed when each in turn tells of a woman, a penitent for the one, a desired object for the other, who is torn between her love and her duty. So we learn that the Duchess has in secret sought the Abbé's confessional to replace her earthly by a heavenly passion. But between the men, each is ignorant of whom the other is speaking, each triumphantly claims his woman in the name of the Church, in the name of human law. And on this they part.

The battle is appointed. The forces are arrayed. The Duchess appears again, more dejected, more susceptible to the argument and the power of love. The Doctor seizes his opportunity and declares himself. Will she not let him help her, let him be ever near her; more than an admirer or amiable comrade—as her lover in short? It is her right and her need. That is why he speaks, and he speaks with conviction.

She seeks to parry. She seeks even to flee. Womanly indignant at first she exclaims, "Then

you are no longer my friend!" She laments her love. The illusion he gave her of trustworthiness is gone. He has lied! With refinement of feeling, she preferred her former aspiration towards him, almost sanctified as it was, sweeter because unattainable, to this hotly felt, earth-born desire. She preferred the image she had forged of him to this real pleading man, now transformed into her enemy. She trembles in her exaltation, and the Doctor, ever ready, catches her up: "*Nous sommes emportés par quelque chose de plus fort que nous.*" He presses forward. She pleads still, but more feebly, more despairingly. She consents at last to a rendezvous—the consent being forced from her.

Here indeed is a duel. But though there is obviously the sexual combat, the deeper interest, the more power lies, I think, in the war waged in the Duchess's own soul. The successive waves of impulse on which she is rushed towards the fatal rock; the undercurrent which sweeps her bewilderingly back; the crest she surmounts and the hollows in which she seems engulfed; the beacon-light of religion seeming useless on the strand and the quaverings of conscience finally unheard in the tempest's tumult—here lies the appeal, the psychology, the dramatic exposition.

The second act is the most beautiful, the nearest perfect, the most stirring. The two scenes between the lovers and between the brothers call for almost unlimited admiration.

The Abbé is alone when his penitent comes to his house for the first time. She has sought him in her sore distress. She tells him how first she was brought to his confessional, many days ago. She was on her way to her lover then, when by haphazard or moved by some vague saving impulse, she entered the church, and the odor of her candid youth came back, ardors and adorations, stars and tears, canticles and communion. Seeing her kneeling there, the Abbé called her into his box, she confessed and was comforted. He has been her only stay and defence ever since. Now his letter asking for charity comes as again she was on her way to the rendezvous. She takes it as a sign.

Only then is the Abbé aware that this unknown penitent was the Duchesse de Chailles. He has hardly begun to give her consolation, when he is

called away, just as the Doctor, who has divined the situation, enters in search of the Duchess. There is a short pregnant dialogue of explanations and recriminations. The Duchess declares herself safe and demands to be left with her lover. The Abbé sees strength in her confidence and leaves them.

The Duchess now seems transformed from her recent helpless and dejected state. Under the immediate influence of her religious feeling, aroused and indignant, she battles magnificently for her honor, for her freedom from the chains of love. She braves Morey's reproaches, and admits no longer his right or his power. Has she broken her word as to the appointment? Her consent to come to him was extorted from her in a moment of weakness. Had she spoken falsely in declaring herself an unbeliever? No, for she *is* an unbeliever still. She prays for faith but possesses it not. Yet her poor piety is a sufficient defence, for thereby has she conquered herself. In the religious light her desires drop like dead serpents.

The Doctor, for his part, had divined her resistance even when she consented, had felt the impalpable force of the priest. He taunts her with her fondness for the *prie-Dieu*. It were far better for her to show a natural human devotion to her lover, rather than such morbid artificial devotion to such antique superstitious mummary. He blames her weakness, her inconsistency. With her, "*c'est le dernier qui parle qui a raison.*"—"*Oui, mais c'est toujours Dieu le dernier.*" He stoops to hint, in his mad jealousy, that it is the man behind the priest who has tempted her, who has dominated her. He uses without effect the ancient Epicurean argument of "*gather ye roses,*" with its accompanying horrors of a loveless old age and a wasted life. But she suffers from the idea of his pain, she grieves that she should trouble, even wreck his existence. She is moved to pity, and love is in the next degree. By the magic of his looks, the sorcery of his words, he is once more on the point of conquering her—when the Abbé reënters and saves the situation. The Duchess leaves in time.

Now, indeed, it is war to the knife between the men. There is the flash and clatter of naked steel. There are angry threats and recriminations, accusations and hot replies. The Doctor openly

declares his feeling, which is now hatred, pure and simple. Let the other take care for himself! The Abbé proudly returns, "Tant que cette âme se réfugiera en moi, je la défendrai." It is his mission to guide the heavenly spark from terrestrial pollution. The Doctor defends himself, boasts of the quality of his love. "Je l'aime toute entière—son âme et son corps." It seems true that his love, while natural, is not sensual. The Abbé feels his trust none the less; he fervently declares that his interference in this matter, the coincidence of the Duchess finding him, her lover's brother, in the confessional box, is nothing less than a miracle, that the divine hand is in it, and the divine will shall be performed. The Doctor laughs at his piety, unworthily descends to threats. He will disclose to the Duchess the Abbé's earlier life of debauchery. He affects to believe, as just now with the Duchess, that the two are drawn together by a less holy bond, that the Abbé himself would corrupt her, that the spiritual claim is a mask for the mundane affection. He almost blasphemes, and is forced away crying that for the possession of the woman the other would throw his scruples and his priest's robe to the winds. Our scientist is not here displayed in a very prepossessing light.

The main episodes in the contest are before you. But certain subjective phenomena are still to be shown, certain inner battles to be won, before the victory can be decided. These are exhibited in the third act.

The evil leaven which the Doctor has instilled into the spirits of the other two begins to work and swell. Each in turn comes to the old Bishop, confessing the beginning of a mutual affection, the Abbé for the Duchess, she for him. Each in turn, in an agony of renunciation, a passion of penance, implores purification and cleansing from this incipient sin. The impulse of both is to flee from the world. The wise Bishop—who has been informed of the opportune death of the Duc de Chailles—sees that no crime has been committed and that no wild resolves should be taken. To the Duchess's desire to get her to a nunnery, he suggests that she wait a little. He holds the solution for her problem; but the Abbé's is now the more serious, for besides this unholy affection, he fears that he is losing his faith. The Bishop, reassures him, in a charming scene of reminis-

cence, where they recall their days as scholar and master. Then . . . and then . . . "vous aviez la foi." Daniel eagerly assents. And he has it still, asserts the other, but slightly clouded by these trials. The Abbé is sobered and steadied. Yet, the Bishop consents to take him to the East as his companion, provided he will have a final interview with the Duchess, for the spiritual chastisement of both, and that he may now recommend her marriage with his brother, for which the way is cleared.

Concerning the conduct and issue of this scene, one need have no fear. The characters of both are too well tried. They approach the subject with a delicacy of feeling, they mount through the treacherous ground to the summit with an *élan* of mysticism, of ideal rapture, which leaves the reader or the hearer far behind. Their souls have met and parted with the sense of a last meeting on heights where none can follow them. For the victory is won. The Abbé and the Duchess have each conquered circumstances and themselves. She will marry the Doctor, but as a free gift, not as an abandonment, and into their relation she will bring the higher elements. The brothers embrace before the curtain falls. We are left with our ears lulled by Daniel's parting counsel to his lady: "Les dix petits doigts d'un enfant, voilà la dizaine, les grains de rosaire que je recommande à vos lèvres,"—a ground of agreement between religion and science of which Spencer for one never dreamed.

I shall expend but few more adjectives of admiration upon the play. It has the *souffle*, the soaring, the divine fire. And it is hard to say more than that. The language is pure, uncolloquial, at times lyrical and always harmonious. It is a pleasure to hear such beautiful prose. There are doubtless some faults of construction and characterization. M. Doumic points out that "les événements paraissent trop arrangés, trop combinés." So for the juxtaposition of the two brothers, which the Abbé called a miracle. Again, there is no adequate reason why the Doctor should seek his brother's house. For the third act, the dramatic interest fails early. The best scenes there are emotional and lyric, too high-pitched for practical acting. But the same reproach will not apply elsewhere.

As to the characters, the old Bishop is fine and

wholesome, and he was excellently interpreted by Mounet-Sully. The Abbé, flawlessly rendered by Le Bargy, is an eager, unquiet spirit, haunted by his former sins, but conscious of a strong uprightness and daring in his cause. His is an artistic religion. "Ne lui demandez ni la simplicité ni l'onction : il est de son temps."

And as for the Duchesse de Chailles, that "proud and troubled spirit which greatens and mounts in her *abattement*"—one needs to see her. Her dignified and noble charm is inexpressible. Hers is the true aristocracy, which knows its obligations. In her much unhappiness, in the bewilderment of her conflict, she keeps our sympathy and respect. Mme. Bartet in the rôle was profound and exquisite. "Simple et toujours vraie, immuablement tragique, figure émue de douleur et de tendresse humaine," one calls her. She is "l'interprète absolue de la tragédie moderne, vibrante et admirable toujours."

M. Doumic finds that the principal fault of this play is in the character of the Doctor Morey. One is displeased and embarrassed to think that the Duchess can love this *rébarbatif* doctor of madmen, who is neither seductive nor sympathetic. Love needs to account for itself on the stage. In his very passion, he presses the triumph of his doctrines. This last seems true. He is far from being adorable, he is not even likable. He is "une espèce d'*âpre sectaire* et de farouche anticlérical. Il est tout à la fois brutal et fat." He is a *butor* and a bear. His deficiencies were shared by his interpreter, who is "continûment raide, dûr, maussade."

This seems a trifle too strong. The Doctor does his duty in his way. Even the Abbé admits that he is good, laborious and devoted to his calling. One is not conscious of being repelled by his personality. But it is true that one can hardly love him. His egoism is prominent. When the Duchess speaks of the infinite esteem she has for him, he thanks her and agrees that he deserves it. Worst of all is his bitterness and violence towards his brother, and his position in the whole affair is quite remote from scientific calm.

If the characters are not rendered equally attractive, the ideas at least for which they stand—and we can draw the discrimination—are presented with an impartiality which shows the mas-

ter-mind. We may not love the Doctor. But in so far as he represents and pleads for individual rights and human happiness and freedom of thought or will, in the highest sense, we are glad to see him triumph in the end. And who shall say that religion is not given her just dues? It is the present state of the question in France which has perhaps inspired the play, which has certainly largely contributed to its actual popularity. But the whole problem, the mighty warfare is nineteen centuries old and older. We are aware that "of all forms of mistake, prophecy is the most gratuitous." Yet in view of the grasp with which the drama, in its leading situations, has been conceived, of the charm with which it has been presented, of the nobility with which it has been invested, one would be tempted to predict for it more than a temporary position on the modern stage. It possesses the robust art which should survive the city, the strong idea facing towards the eternal.

E. P. DARGAN.

Johns Hopkins University.

A RECENT FRENCH DICTIONARY.

If simplicity of definition, correctness of pronunciation, and clearness of impression are the essential features in a school dictionary, the ideal type is now offered us in the new *Uniform International Dictionary of French and English*.¹ As the editor says in his preface, the volume is intended primarily for the use of English-speaking people, hence all explanatory words and phrases are in English throughout the work. This fact is noticeable, also, in the character of the explanations, which are directly intended to help the English student, though, as a rule, they are sufficient for the foreigner as well. In looking over the distinguishing features of the dictionary, the reviewer was first of all struck by the attractive appearance and arrangement of the word-list.

¹Published by Hinds, Noble & Eldredge, New York, Paul Passy, Editorial Critic of French Pronunciation, George Hempl, Editorial Critic of English Pronunciation, Preface signed by Robert Morris Pierce.

Each word is given in the form which it has on any printed page, undisguised by fanciful signs to save space for the publisher; each word is differentiated from the following pronunciation and definition by clear, bold-faced type, of a size in keeping with the text of the definitions; finally, all the words in the list are carefully aligned in the column so that they may be rapidly run over without interruption or fatigue to the eye. The pages, also, are so wide that there is usually room enough for the translation on the same line, and the book will lie open at any desired place. The adoption of the customary form of the word has necessitated a transcription to indicate the pronunciation, and for this purpose the alphabet of the *Association phonétique* has most properly been used. However, as it is still too soon to expect everyone to have mastered this alphabet in its entirety, keywords are given at the bottom of each page, thus obviating the necessity of constant reference to the table of sounds in the introduction. With regard to the definitions, the words are directly translated rather than defined, but in all cases where confusion might arise, or where no equivalent expression exists in the second language, ample notes are given to ensure a clear understanding of the term in question.

The contents of the word-list are in every way sufficient for the usual study of French literature, in order the more closely to show its exact scope, a series of comparisons has been made with other standard dictionaries of the same class. In the French-English division the section *s-saie* has been compared with the *Dictionnaire général* of Darmesteter-Hatzfeld-Thomas and the section *g-galerie* with *Gasc's Student's Dictionary*, giving the following results:

In *Uniform International*, not in *Dictionnaire général*: sabbataire, sabbatisme, sabéen, sabéisme, sabin, sabisme, sableur, sabordement, sabotage, saboteur, sabuleux, saccatier, sacchareux, saccharifère, saccharification, saccharifier, sacciforme, sacerdotalisme, sacerdotaux, sachem, sacrebleu, sacrificatoire, saducéen, saducéisme, safrané, safrerie, saga, sagination.

In *Dictionnaire général*, not in *Uniform International*: sabbatine, sabrenaud, sacramentement, sade, sadinet, safranier, sagoutier, sagum.

In *Uniform International*, not in *Gasc*: gaban,

gabet (worm), gâchage, gailleterie, gailletin, gainière, galéobdolon.

In *Gasc*, not in *Uniform International*: gabarer, gabari, gabariage, gabarit, gabarot, gabian, gabie, gabionnage, gabionneur, gabronite, gadolinite, gaduine, gague, gaïacène, gaïacine, gaïacique, gal, galactagogue, galactite, almost all galacto-compounds, galago, galanthe, galate, galatée, galauban, galbanon, galbanoner, galber, galbeux, galbule, galéiforme, galéopithèque.

In the English-French division a comparison is made with the *James and Molé Dictionary*, section *c-cad*, and with the *Gasc*, section *r-racy*.

In *Uniform International*, not in *James and Molé*: cabala, cabalism, cabbage-head, cabby, cabin-boy, cabinet-size, cable-car, cabriolet, cacao, cachou.

In *James and Molé*, not in *Uniform International*: cab (verb), caballer, cabined, cabinet-council, -making, -photograph, caburns, cachet, cack, cackling, cacoehymic, cacophonic.

In *Uniform International*, not in *Gasc*: ra, raceway, racial, racially.

In *Gasc*, not in *Uniform International*: rabbin, rabbinship, rabbinism, rabbinist, rabbit-burrow, rabbit-hole, rabbit-fish, rabbit-skin, rabbitry, race-calendar, racing and compounds, rachis, rack-ladder, rack-rent, racketing, racoonda.

In the matter of pronunciation, the editors have endeavored to follow the best popular usage rather than arbitrary rules, the following list of words with varying pronunciation will show the result of their efforts²:

In the English-French section the standard is the customary usage in the United States, *r* is a recognized sound, and in words of more than one pronunciation the popular form is almost invari-

² Letters in italics are alone referred to; silent letters are indicated by parentheses, close vowels by acute accent, open vowels by grave accent, *l'* is for *l* mouillé. Abbreviations as follows: Un. I., *Uniform International*; D. G., *Dictionnaire général*; M. P., *Michaelis et Passy, Dictionnaire phonétique*, Hanovre et Berlin, 1897; Nyr., *Kr. Nyrop, Manuel phonétique du français parlé*, 2e édit., Copenhagen, Leipzig, Paris, 1902; Pltz., *K. Ploetz, Systematische Darstellung der französischen Aussprache*, Berlin, 1897; Rous., *Roussetot et Laclotte, Précis de Prononciation française*, Paris, Leipzig, 1902; Les., *M.-A. Lesaint, Traité Complet de la Prononciation française*, 3e édit. revue par C. Vogel, Halle, 1890.

	UN. I.	D. G.	M. P.	NYR.	PLTZ.	ROUS.	LES.
<i>aout</i>	àu	u	àu	both	u	u	u
<i>as</i>	á	á	à, á			á	á
<i>avril</i>	l	l, (l)	both		both	both	both
<i>cil</i>	l	l	l		l, (l)		l, (l)
<i>cerf</i>	(f)	f, (f) old	both	f	both	f	f
<i>nerf</i>	(f)	f	both	f	f	f	f
<i>nerfs</i>		(f)	(f)	(f), f	(f)	(f)	(f)
<i>jadis</i>	à-s	à, s, (s) old	á-(s), à-s	à-s	à-s	s	à-s
<i>legs</i>	g(s)	(gs)	both	both	both	g(s)	g(s)
<i>laurier</i>	ò	ó	ò	ò (Laure)	ó (Laure)	intermediate	
<i>mauvais</i>	ò	ó	both	ò	ò		
<i>aurore</i>	ò	ó	ò	ò			
<i>aujourd'hui</i>	ò	ó	both				
<i>aumône</i>	ó-ò	ó-ó	both		ó-ò	ó-ó	ó-ò
<i>hôtel</i>	ò	ó	both	ò	ò	ó	
<i>os, sing.</i>	ós, òs	òs	òs, ós	òs	ó, ós, òs	òs	òs
<i>os, pl.</i>	ós, òs, ó (ergot)	o	ó, ós	ó	ó, ós, òs	o	
<i>gens</i>	s	(s)	both	(s)	s preferred	(s) preferred	(s) preferred.
<i>linceul</i>	l'	l, l' old	both			l	l
<i>poignard</i>	wàn'	òn'	both	on'	wàn'	both	wàn', òn' fam.
<i>poêle</i>	wà	wá	both	wà	wà	both	wá
<i>pays</i>	éj	èj	é, éij	éj		éj	éi
<i>rail</i>	áj	àj, èl	áj, èl		áj		aj
<i>quai</i>	é	è	both	é	é	é	é
<i>saisir</i>	è	é	è			e intermediate	
<i>damnation</i>	á-à	á-à	à-á		á-á		á-à

ably cited, for example, *con'template*, *peremp'tory*, *visor* (*i* as in *like*), *squirrel* (*i* like *u* in *but*), *squalor* (*a* as in *far*).

The only section of the work open as a whole to adverse criticism is the list of French proper names which the student of French would certainly find much more helpful if it contained a greater proportion of names famous in French history and letters, such as Mme de Sévigné, Colbert, Victor Hugo, rather than Classic names almost identical in French and English, or those of such foreigners as Scaliger and Sforza. The omission of the names of so many great Frenchmen is not only a serious defect in the dictionary, but a distinct loss to the student world, for the writer knows of no good, concise list of French proper names, with pronunciation, and surely no names are more often mispronounced by the average American college-man.

With the foregoing exception, the *Uniform International* may be called a perfect dictionary for school and college use and the reviewer may say that he has already had the pleasure of recommending it to his own classes.

MURRAY P. BRUSH.

Johns Hopkins University.

Étude sur la langue de Frère Angier suivie d'un glossaire de ses poèmes, par MILDRED K. POPE, docteur de l'Université de Paris.

The work of Frère Angier consists of a translation of the Dialogues and a Life of Gregory the Great. Paul Meyer published in the *Romania* (Vol. XII, pp. 145-208) a study of the Life. I myself published a study of the Dialogues and the original parts of the work, which consist of the introductions to the four books of the translation. Miss Pope, by a comparative study of the language of the Dialogues and the Life, has endeavored to determine the native country of Frère Angier. The following are in brief her conclusions:

(1) The orthography is a blending of the Anglo-Norman and Continental.

(2) The versification of the Dialogues is almost as correct as that of purely French authors of the time, while in the Life, dated two years later, the usual incorrectness of Anglo-Norman authors commences to appear.

(3) The vocabulary contains words which show the relations of Frère Angier's language with the

dialects of the West of France and the French of England.

(4) The study of the phonology, morphology, versification and vocabulary shows that the two dialects which have contributed to form Frère Angier's language are : the dialect of the West of France, which is the basis, and the Anglo-Norman, which is only an adventitious element added later.

(5) The fact that the language of Frère Angier combines the linguistic characteristics of Bretagne and Touraine seems to indicate Anjou as his native country.

Miss Pope says that the deformation of the Poitevin in *affar* and *seignar* must be ascribed to a writer who lived near enough to Poitou to have some knowledge of the language. The isolated occurrence of *affar* and *seignar* (for the sake of the rime) is probably a reminiscence of the Provençal of which he may have had some knowledge through literary sources. It is possible that Frère Angier derived a large part of the extremely variegated language through literary channels, or from the society which he frequented in England. The Continental characteristics of Frère Angier's language are beyond question. But the artificiality of the language, amply attested by elements from so many different dialects, renders difficult the determination of his native country with any degree of certainty. The evidence does not seem sufficient to justify the conclusion that he was born in France.

In matter of detail, there is nothing of importance to add.

TIMOTHY CLORAN.

University of Madrid.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTES ON SIDNEY'S *Defense of Poesy*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS :—It has long been recognized that in the *Defense of Poesy* Sidney drew rather liberally upon Scaliger's *Poetices*. The following cases of slight indebtedness, however, seem thus far to have escaped notice. In evidence that history borrows

from poetry, Sidney says : 'So Herodotus entitled his history by the name of the nine Muses ; and both he and all the rest that followed him either stole or usurped of poetry their passionate describing of passions, the many particularities of battles which no man could affirm, or, if that be denied me, long orations put in the mouths of great kings and captains, which it is certain they never pronounced' (*Defense*, ed. Cook, 4. 8-15). With this passage compare the following : 'Nam quemadmodum Tragici rem ipsam denarrant veram : personis actiones, ac dicta accommodant : sic Livius & Thucydides interserunt conciones, quae nunquam ab iis quibus sunt attributæ, cognitæ fuerunt' (Scaliger, *Poetices Libri Septem* 1. 2) ; that is : 'For as the tragic poets base their plays upon true events, but adapt the actions and speeches to the characters, so Livy and Thucydides insert orations which were never recognized by those to whom they were attributed.'

Again, in maintaining that the morals taught by Plato were by no means superior to those inculcated by the poets, Sidney writes : 'But who should do thus, I confess, should requite the objections made against poets with like cavillations against philosophers ; as likewise one should do that should bid one read *Phædrus* or *Symposium* in Plato, or the *Discourse of Love* in Plutarch, and see whether any poet do authorize abominable filthiness, as they do' (41. 26-32). In like vein, Scaliger says : 'Respiciat ipse (Plato) sese quot ineptas, quot spurcas fabellas inserat : quas Graecanicum scelus olentes sententias identidem inculcet. Certe *Symposium* & *Phædrum*, atque alia monstra operæpretium fuerit nunquam legisse' (1. 2) ; that is : 'Plato should remark how many impertinent and low stories he himself employs ; what filthy thoughts this Greek rogue often forces upon us. Surely the *Symposium*, the *Phædrus*, and other such monstrous productions are not worth reading.' See *Yale Studies in English* 26. 15, 17.

We may further observe that Sidney follows Scaliger in giving the epic the supreme place in poetry. Thus Sidney writes : 'But if anything be already said in the defense of sweet poetry, all concurrereth to the maintaining the heroical, which is not only a kind, but the best and most accomplished kind of poetry' (30. 25-28). With

this passage compare the following: 'Dicebamus supra, omni in re unum quippiam esse rectum ac primum: quod aliorum norma sit, ita ut ad id cætera omnia referantur. Tota igitur in Poesi, Epica ratio illa qua Heroum genus, vita, gesta describuntur, princeps esse videtur: ad cujus rationem reliquæ Poeseos partes dirigantur' (Scaliger, *Poetices Libri Septem* 3. 96. 'We have already remarked that for objects of every kind there exists one perfect original to which all the rest can be referred as their norm and standard. In epic poetry, which describes the descent, life, and deeds of heroes, all other kinds of poetry have such a norm, so that to it they turn for their regulative principles'). See *Yale Studies in English* 26. 54.

FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD.

University of Washington.

INGOMAR.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*,

SIRS:—The following parallel to the well-known lines of *Ingomar*,

"Two souls with but a single thought,
Two hearts that beat as one,"

has not hitherto been noted, I believe:

Et fecit duo corda unum, duo traxit in unum
Pectora; sensus inest nobis et spiritus idem.
—Mantuan, *Eclog.*, III, fol. cxiii.

R. T. KERLIN.

New Haven, Conn.

GUIDO GUINICELLI'S SIMILE.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—As a further instance of the use of that simile which was the subject of the paper, *A Simile of Guido Guinicelli's*, by Professor Cook in the March number of *Modern Language Notes* for 1905, may be included these lines from Middleton's *More Dissemblers Besides Women* (I. 3. 35-8):

The world shall witness
That, like the sun, my constancy can look
On earth's corruptions, and shine clear itself.

GEORGE B. TENNANT.

Yale University.

FAR BETWEEN.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—I came lately upon a curiously isolated early instance of this adjectival phrase. The prevailing use of (*few and*) *far between* presumably springs from Campbell's well-known line,

Like angel-visits, few and far between,
(*Pleas. Hope* ii. 372.)

echoing one of Blair's, as shown in the New English Dictionary. In *Sir Isumbras* (Thornton *Romances*, ed. Camden Soc.) we read (ll. 168-170)

Thay entirde thane a water kene,
The bankes were full ferre bytwene,
And waters breme als bare.

In the text printed by Professor Schleich (Berlin, 1901), the words do not occur, but the editor cites as variant readings,

The bankys wer fulle wyde (ferre T)
betwen (a twynne E) ATE.

H. E. G. ROPE.

Breslau, Germany.

Julius Cæsar 2. 2. 104.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In *Julius Cæsar* 2. 2. 104, Cæsar, who has just been greeted by the conspirators as he issued from the house, asks Brutus, 'What is't o' clock?' and Brutus responds, 'Cæsar, 'tis stricken eight.' Is there not a double meaning in this reply of Brutus? Now that the assassination has been determined upon, the mind of the sensitive Brutus is feverishly schooling itself to the crime, and his words may well mean that in spirit the eight conspirators have already murdered Cæsar. It is to be noted that in a speech immediately following, Shakespeare puts irony into the mouth of Trebonius. Cæsar says:

Remember that you call on me to-day:
Be near me, that I may remember you.

Trebonius replies:

Cæsar, I will:—(*aside*) and so near will I be
That your best friends shall wish I had been further.

FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD.

University of Washington.